The Congregational Quarterly

Editor :
ALBERT PEEL, M.A., LITT.D.

Editorial Board :
MR. B. L. MANNING, M.A. | REV. ARTHUR PRINGLE.
REV. E. J. PRICE, M.A., B.D. | REV. W. B. SELBIE, M.A., D.D.
MR. HAROLD SHEPHEARD, M.A.

The Congregational Union of England and Wales is not responsible for opinions expressed in these pages, nor is the Editor responsible for the views of contributors.

THE CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY is published on the 20th of March, June, September, and December, each quarter, by the Publication Department of the Congregational Union of England and Wales. It may be obtained from the publishers at 2s. 6d. a copy (plus postage), or 10s. per annum post free, or from any bookseller at 2s. 6d.

All contributions (typewritten where possible) should be addressed to the Editor at Shirley, Russell Road, Buckhurst Hill, Essex, with stamped envelope for return in case of non-acceptance.

Vol. VII, No. 3 **JULY, 1929**

CONTENTS.

[*For biographical sketches of the contributors see p. xi.*]

EDITORIAL - - - - - - - -

THE THEOLOGY OF KIERKEGAARD - H. R. MACKINTOSH

THE WILBERFORCE OF AFRICA - - A. M. CHIRGWIN

THE MODERN PREACHER AS POET - - LANCELOT J. VINALL

MODERNISM AND ESCHATOLOGY - - G. V. JONES

BETTER FOLLOWS WORSE - - - G. FRANK CULLEN

HISTORY, POLITICS, AND RELIGION IN CERTAIN POEMS OF WILLIAM COWPER - - B. L. MANNING

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS—

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN AMERICA - CARL S. PATTON

YOUTH AND THE CHURCH - - - ELSPETH COLLIER

BAHAISM - - - - - - - - J. L. T. E. JONES

SALVAGING PERSONALITY - - - JOHN WRIGHT BUCKHAM

ON LIFE AND BOOKS :

THE OTHER HALF - - - - - ALBERT PEEL

FOREIGN REVIEWS. By Drs. J. P. NAISH, SYDNEY CAVE, W. B. SELBIE, and Rev. E. R. MICKLEM, M.A.

CURRENT LITERATURE. By the EDITOR, Rev. C. H. DODD, M.A., Dr. A. E. GARVIE, Rev. E. J. PRICE, M.A., B.D., Drs. A. J. GRIEVE, A. SOUTER, SYDNEY CAVE, R. MACKINTOSH, Mrs. M. SOWBY, B.A., and Dr. W. B. SELBIE.

SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST. By the EDITOR and Mr. H. B. SHEPHEARD, M.A.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS - - -

(Made and Printed in Great Britain.)

RECUMBENT WORSHIPPERS

Surely one of the most unique congregations, meeting at regular intervals in England for worship, is that which gathers in the Chapel of the British Home and Hospital for Incurables at Streatham. Some of the congregation, with the aid of the staff, take their seats in the pews. Others, totally helpless, are wheeled into their places on invalids' couches. They, perforce, are *recumbent* worshippers. This Institution, which is for MIDDLE-CLASS PEOPLE ONLY, is maintained by the gifts of the kind-hearted. Will you send much-needed help (say a £1 note) as a thank-offering for the health you enjoy?

The British Home and Hospital for Incurables

STREATHAM, LONDON, S.W.16

(FOUNDED 1861).

Secretary, Edgar Penman.

Office: 72 Cheapside, London, E.C. 2.

WORLD DOMINION

An International Review of Christian Progress.

Issued Quarterly. Single Copies, 1/-. Annual Subscription, 4/6 post free.

Contents for July, 1929.
Volume VII, No. 3.

Achieving the Impossible in World Evangelization.
A Serious Crisis in World Missions.
Marshal Feng Postpones Preaching.
Torture of China's Turmoil.
Taking a Census in a Chinese City.
Among Wild Tribes in South West China.
Work and Play among Lepers.
Sulu Archipelago and its People.
Salvation Army in Dutch East Indies.
Along the India Road.
Startling and Perplexing facts in Burma.
A Far-Reaching Work of Healing.
Non-Professional Missionaries in India.
Revival in Russia and its Borderlands.
Bolshevism and Christianity.
At the Gates of Paris.
An African's Morning Prayer.
Serious Migration Movements in Africa.
A Strange Church Offering.
Pioneering Among Amazonia's Indians.
Interesting Events in the Far East; Holiday for War-Lords; Candid Comments; Harnessing Nile and Exploiting Dead Sea; A Church on Fire; Can Jews be Converted?; Future of French Protestantism; French Influence in North Africa; Liquor Traffic on the Gold Coast; Revolutionary Ideas, etc.

WORLD DOMINION PRESS,
1 Tudor Street, London, E.C. 4.

SMEDLEY'S

"The Book of Smedley's"

(FREE on application).

'Phone: Matlock 17.

'Grams: Smedley's, 'Matlock'

GREAT BRITAIN'S GREATEST HYDRO

Without Superior for Comfort, Pleasure and Health. 270 Bedrooms. Moderate Tariff. Magnificent Grounds of Ten Acres.

No Branch Establishments.

WRITE FOR ILLUSTRATED PROSPECTUS.

MATLOCK

OUR CONTRIBUTORS.

Rev. H. R. Mackintosh, M.A., D.Phil., D.D., Prof. of Systematic Theology, New College, Edinburgh; author of *The Person of Jesus Christ, etc.*

Rev. A. M. Chirgwin, M.A., Congregational Minister, Field Secretary of the London Missionary Society.

Rev. Lancelot J. Vinall, Congregational Minister, St. Helens.

Mr. G. V. Jones, B.A., Mansfield College, Oxford.

Rev. G. Frank Cullen, Hayling Island; Congregational Minister, retired.

Mr. B. L. Manning, M.A., Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge; author of *The People's Faith in the Time of Wyclif, etc.*

Rev. Carl S. Patton, D.D., Ph.D., Prof. of Preaching and Church Work at the Theological Seminary, Chicago.

Miss Elspeth Collier, B.A., Office Secretary to the Auxiliary Movement of the S.C.M.

Rev. John Wright Buckham, D.D., Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Cal., U.S.A.; author of *Religion and Experience, Personality and Psychology, etc.*

STUDENT CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT.

THE MAKING OF MODERN ENGLISH RELIGION.

An Historical Impression of certain Religious Forces in Modern English History. By BERNARD L. MANNING, Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge. 3s. 6d. net.

PERSONALITY AND PROGRESS.

By HENRY T. HODGKIN, M.A., M.B., Secretary of the National Christian Council of China. Author of "The Way of Jesus," etc. With a Foreword by Dr. RUFUS M. JONES. 4s. 6d. net.

"This book is rightly concerned with reality as well as with adventure; with God as well as with social human relationships. It is a book that is pretty sure to enlighten and at the same time fortify the will of the reader."—*From the Foreword.*

EXPERIENCE OF GOD.

A Brief Enquiry into the Grounds of Christian Conviction. By HERBERT H. FARMER, M.A., Minister of the Presbyterian Church, New Barnet. Author of "Things Not Seen." 5s. net.

THE CHRISTIAN'S ALTERNATIVE TO WAR.

An Examination of Christian Pacifism. By LEYTON RICHARDS, M.A., Minister of Carrs Lane Church, Birmingham. 4s. net; paper, 2s. 6d. net.

"Wherever this book goes it will multiply the disciples of peace; it will deepen and strengthen the growing horror and hatred of war. I would it could find its way into the hands of every Christian man and woman throughout the English-speaking world." —*Manchester Guardian.*

THE DIVINE COMPANIONSHIP.

A Book of Prayers. By J. S. HOYLAND, Author of "Prayers for use in an Indian College," "God in the Commonplace," etc. 2s. 6d. net.

Write for New Spring List—32 RUSSELL SQUARE, LONDON, W.C. 1

WHEN YOU VISIT
LONDON

STAY AT HOTELS CONTROLLED BY THE

BONNINGTON HOTELS, LTD.

BONNINGTON HOTEL
Southampton Row, W.C.1

260 Rooms

Winter Garden. Lounge. Drawing, Smoking & Conference Rooms. Masonic Temple.

CORA HOTEL
Upper Woburn Place, W.C. 1

230 Rooms

Opened—June, 1924
Newly & Charmingly Furnished
Two Minutes from EUSTON, ST. PANCRAS and KING'S CROSS STATIONS

Running H. & C. Water in most rooms.

NEAR TUBES, THEATRES AND SHOPS

Room, Attendance and Table d'Hôte Breakfast - 8/6
Full Board - from 13/- per day (4 days minimum)

Apply Manager of either Hotel.

The
Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL.

THE Election is over. As might have been expected, " Safety First " has made no appeal to the young voter, and Mr. Baldwin finds himself with some 30 votes less than Labour, which has swept the industrial districts. Mr. Lloyd George's attempt to stage a " comeback " has failed, and the prophecies of a Liberal revival and 150 seats in Parliament now give rise to ribald laughter. For once the Labour Party proved themselves excellent electioneers. They had two great assets, Lord Birkenhead and Mr. Lloyd George, and they used them to the full. Every time Lord Birkenhead opened his mouth he won votes for Labour: for he would not let people forget the rotten state of society which enables a man to own seven motor-cars and to step into directorships that bring him tens of thousands a year. The louder Mr. Lloyd George shouted his promises the more men thought of his post-war record, while it was amazing how one so astute as he should have failed to realize that every reference he made to the war lost votes and did not win them—in this day and with a youthful electorate *that* horse will not run.

Disturbing as the resulting stalemate is, the election has yet many gratifying features. Is it not safer to have international affairs in Labour hands than in those of Sir Austen Chamberlain, with a fire-eater like Mr. Churchill at his elbow? From Mr. Baldwin's Government we could expect words in regard to disarmament, but words only: now we may hope that Britain will not wait on the agreement of other nations, but will give a lead.

The strengthening of the Temperance forces in the House is another cause for satisfaction. Many of the most prominent of the supporters of the brewing interest have been thrown out, and there may be enough vim in the reinforced Temperance group to make Labour take action. Labour's shilly-shallying about the drink problem through fear of the club vote has been one of the most discreditable things in the Party's recent history: " Safety First," they might learn, will pay them no more than it has paid Mr. Baldwin.

The Liberal Party? It is still small in numbers, but it is greatly increased in power, not merely in personnel but in the rejection of those who have borne the Liberal name and consistently supported Conservative policy. Their departure will make for consolidation and, it is hoped, for an uncompromising witness for true Liberalism. Whether the Liberal Parliamentary Party will be content to serve under Mr. Lloyd George's leadership remains to be seen. Possibly they will think that the peculiar situation gives such unrivalled

scope for his particular gifts that they must retain him at all costs. Possibly, however, he will retire, realizing that his leadership is no longer an asset to the Party. Possibly, whether he does or not, Sir Herbert Samuel, Sir John Simon, or Sir Donald Maclean may be elected leader, while it is not outside the range of possibility that the younger element will refuse to be led by any of the participants in the old feud, and, while not altogether saying to Mr. Lloyd George, " Thy money perish with thee," may yet find a new leader in one of their own number, and work out the Party's salvation that way. For, despite all that may be said, a Party with 5,000,000 votes is far from dead. It will be so, however, if its record in the last Parliament should be repeated. This is its last chance: if it fails, Liberals will find a way of expressing their Liberalism through some other Party, as so many of them have done already.

Meanwhile the reform of the electoral system becomes more and more urgent, as its anomalies become increasingly obvious. Half the members represent minorities: a Liberal M.P. represents about 100,000 votes, a Conservative 30,000, and a Labour 25,000. In proportion to the votes cast the Liberals would have about 160 seats. The Liberal Party suffers to-day. But it may be the Conservative to-morrow, and Labour the day after. Which Party will have the courage to tackle the question?

* * *

THERE was not a great deal to chronicle about the May Meetings. Mr. Rhondda Williams's Chairman's Address was criticized by young men, on the one hand, because it was " essentially Victorian " and " flogging dead horses," and, on the other, because it did not represent " the faith of our fathers." The Chairman has probably decided that the criticisms cancel out, and that he was on right lines!

Most interest was aroused by Mr. Gerard Ford's insistence that the Congregational Report on the Lausanne Conference forsook our specific Congregational witness. Those who prepared the Report were firmly convinced that they had safeguarded that witness at all points, and a careful reading of the whole Report would, we think, bear out their contention. But it is well that any possibility of misunderstanding should be removed, and Mr. Ford rightly urged that a sentence of the Report where some of the Lausanne findings were cited suggested that Congregationalists agreed that the ministry was necessary to the being of the Church. Mr. Ford, we understand, quoted our own pages as emphatically contradicting such a view. They have always done so, and will continue to do so. A church is composed of Christian people gathered together for worship, fellowship, and service, their common faith in Christ, ever present with them as leader and guide, making them a church. No ministry, and certainly no ministry gaining its Orders through one channel only, is necessary to the being of a church. Congregationalists

believe that a church can, at any time, appoint any of its members to perform any function—even that of the ministry of the Word and sacraments. This does not mean, of course, that such a group of Christians does not, immediately or nearly so, proceed to appoint its members to special offices—as an assembly appoints a chairman: it separates Barnabas and Saul for the work of ministering, and so on.

This is especially important to-day because of the desires, recently expressed, for union between Presbyterians and Congregationalists, for it is doubtful whether Presbyterians (and it ought not to be overlooked that some Congregational ministers are really Presbyterian) would in any circumstances allow a layman to administer the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. We seem to remember some words about new presbyter and old priest: and there is nothing priestly in the Congregational conception of the ministry.

Of more immediate importance is it, however, that Anglicans should understand our position, especially in view of the reaction the South India proposals might have in this country. So many Anglicans seem to think that the only trouble is with an "interim period," after which, when all present ministers are dead and gone, all will agree to be episcopally ordained. This is merely to bury the head in the sand. It is not the interim period that worries us; it is the whole doctrine of apostolic succession, which we believe to be utterly pernicious, and one of the greatest handicaps of the Church in its fight for the Kingdom of God. We cannot imagine anything more remote from the opinion of the rank and file of Free Churchmen than such a view as that of the Archbishop of York in his May *Diocesan Gazette*:—

> In all schemes for Re-union between Reformed Churches there has been agreement, so far as I know, that after the Union all ordinations shall be episcopal. These schemes, therefore, provide that, when the period of transition is ended, the Apostolic Succession will be secured in the united Church. So far as differences arise, they concern the interim period. Here we have at once to safeguard our Catholic heritage, but to take care that we do not so safeguard it for ourselves as to miss the chance of imparting it to others. A scheme which in fact brings within the scope of the Apostolic Succession, as we understand it, those ministries which are now without it, has obviously asserted the Catholic principle of the Ministry with great effectiveness. It is, as I think, in that perspective that we must consider how far proposals for the difficult period of transition really compromise that principle. It is merely misleading to isolate the proposals for transition, and to denounce them as surrendering a principle, if the effect of the scheme as a whole will be, after a short lapse of time, to establish that principle in a position of dominance over the whole field.
>
> Certainly the proposals for the interim must be very carefully scrutinized; we are trustees for a heritage of priceless value for the whole Church and must not whittle it away. But we are equally bound not to miss the chance of bestowing this gift on a wider fellowship of Christians if such an opportunity is offered. Our duty is not only to uphold our principles but to commend them.

It cannot be said too clearly that while we want with all our hearts to work and worship with all followers of Christ, we do *not* want our ministries "brought within the scope of Apostolic Succession," and we do not intend to allow the principle of Apostolic Succession to be "established in a position of dominance over the whole field," for that, we believe, would be cutting off one of the arms with which the Church should fight the battle of the Lord. Hundreds, thousands, of Free Church ministers would give up their ministries to-morrow were the only condition of retaining them that of Apostolic Succession.

* * *

THE April number of *The Christian Union Quarterly*, which, under Dr. Peter Ainslie's editorship, has rendered such conspicuous service to the cause it exists to serve, has an interesting editorial paragraph entitled, "Will the Churches Sign a Reconciliation Pact Among Themselves?" Dr. Ainslie, of course, thinks that where sovereign States have given a lead, the churches should not be backward. He prints the 78 words of the Kellogg Pact, "brief and clear as crystal in its outlawry of war," registering "the opening of a new era in the calendar of the world." Desiring the churches to move on similar lines, he drafted a reconciliation pact, which reads as follows:—

> "We, Christians of various churches, believing that only in a co-operative and united Christendom can the world be Christianized, deplore a divided Christendom as being opposed to the Spirit of Christ and the needs of the world; and we are convinced that the Christianizing of the world is greatly hindered by divisive and rivalling churches.
>
> "We, therefore, desire to express our sympathetic interest in and prayerful attitude toward all conferences, small and large, that are looking toward reconciliation of the divided Church of Christ; and we propose to practise, in all our spiritual fellowships, the equality of all Christians before God, so that no Christian shall be denied membership in our churches, nor a place in our celebration of the Lord's supper, nor any ministry be denied the courtesies of our pulpits; and, further, irrespective of denominational barriers, we pledge to be brethren one to another in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour, whose we are and whom we serve."

This was submitted to 100 American Christians connected with various churches. Fourteen did not reply, including the four Roman Catholic Cardinals and the representatives of the Eastern Orthodox Church; five were out of the country; thirteen declined to sign for various reasons; five were willing to sign with reservations; sixty-three (from sixteen denominations which have an aggregate membership of more than sixteen million) affixed their signatures. The names are given. There are, of course, many Congregationalists, Baptists, Presbyterians, and Methodists, and also well-known Episcopalians like Bishop Parsons of San Francisco.

We wonder what would be the welcome accorded to such a pact in this country. Bishop Gore, of course, would not sign it, nor the Editor of the *Church Times*. Would the Archbishop of York or the Editor of *The Guardian*?

* * *

THE recent publication of numerous useful, timely, and scholarly books by the denominational publishing houses, such as the Epworth and Kingsgate Presses, leads us to ask whether the time has not arrived when the Free Church publishing houses should work together. Could they not render a great service to Christians and non-Christians alike by the issue of cheap, popular books of modern apologetics? The gulf between the Christian scholar and the pew is wide indeed: that between the scholar and the man in the street, vaguely searching after truth and mental satisfaction, is wider still, and it will soon be unbridgeable if the churches do not get to work and make the best use of the printed word and of broadcasting. One of the greatest needs of the day is for Christian truth in its modern dress to be attractively presented to the masses of the people—the style in which some theologians write their books is an offence against God and man! This duty should not be left to the enterprise of the Student Christian Movement or of publishing firms: it should be performed by the churches themselves. The United Council of Missionary Education has shown something of what can be done when denominational Missionary Societies co-operate. Let the example be followed in missionary work at home.

* * *

ONE of the most striking features of Free Church life to-day is the attention which is being given to the drama as a means of Christian education. It was good to find the subject down for consideration at the Congregational May Meetings, and also to learn of the formation of a Religious Drama Council. A volume is in preparation which will not only offer guidance as to production of plays, but will give a list of plays suitable for church organizations. It is often a tragedy to see young people with any amount of dramatic talent prostituting their gifts in "sketches" or "dialogues" that are worse than valueless, and it is high time the denominations did something constructive by suggesting the right kind of play. Many churches have already made progress on these lines. Some of them have dramatic societies that are extremely ambitious. Others attempt pageants on a small scale. Recently we have had several dramatizations of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, while the Congregational Church of St. Ives, Hunts, has successfully dramatized the *Book of Ruth*. There has been great improvement, too, in recent years in the standard of missionary plays.

With these thoughts in mind we naturally can give a very cordial welcome to a volume that has just arrived from America—*Modern*

Religious Dramas (Holt, $3.00). This volume is edited by Prof. Fred Eastman, of the Chicago Theological Seminary. We saw something of Professor Eastman's work at first hand last year and wondered which would be the first Theological College in England to have a Professor of " Religious Literature and Drama," which is the name of the chair Professor Eastman holds. He takes his students through the great plays of ancient, medieval, and modern times, teaches them how to produce plays, and encourages them to write plays themselves for examination and criticism. His own play, *Bread,* reprinted in this volume, is an excellent model. Altogether there are eleven plays, which were selected from two hundred offered, and two pageants : most of them are very good and could be presented as effectively to an English audience as to an American. The tests applied in selection were :—

Is the play interesting?
Will it have a religious effect upon an audience?
Do the characters have the breath of life in them?
Does the play have an adequate plot involving strong situation, conflict, suspense, choice, climax, and satisfactory solution?
Does it succeed in reaching the emotions?
Is the dialogue natural?
Does the play come within the limitations of the average church's equipment and cast?
Will it have a religious value for the actors, increasing their appreciation of character, situation, and background?
Will its total effect point out or mirror the truths of life?

Professor Eastman has some wise advice in his Introduction. He points out that the churches are not using drama because it is

> a new wrinkle in religious education or a means of making Bible stories interesting to children. *It is a deliberate attempt to develop strength, beauty, and power in the imaginative and creative life of the players and the audience.* It is no fad; its roots go down to the beginnings of both religion and drama. Its immediate warrant lies in the need of our times for a spiritual ministry to the æsthetic and emotional life of our people. Its fruit is in human lives enriched in understanding, sympathy, and fellowship.

He insists that it is better to present a one-act play well than a three-act play inadequately, and he makes suggestions for plays based on Bible incidents.

We are specially glad to see the preliminary note about royalties, which we pass on for the consideration of all interested in this subject :

> " Our church wishes to produce a good religious drama. Won't you suggest one—especially one which requires no payment of royalty for production? "
>
> How often the request has come! Suppose, however, it were slightly altered : " Our church wishes to give a dinner. Won't you suggest a shop where we can get meat and vegetables without paying for them? " The answer would be obvious.

Now it costs labour, time, and money to write and print plays just as surely as it does to produce meat and vegetables. Practically the only financial compensation the authors and publishers of plays receive is through the payment of royalties for production rights. It is a matter of justice and ethics, as well as of law, therefore, that the small royalties asked for the privilege of producing these plays be paid promptly and in accordance with the special arrangements noted in each instance.

Once the churches understand this fact the requests for plays without royalty will cease, for the Church above all organizations believes and teaches that the labourer is worthy of his hire.

* * *

The question of religious education is destined to be of supreme importance in this as in other countries in the near future, and the churches should be giving the matter their serious attention. It concerns them both on the Sunday and on the week-day. As yet it cannot be said that they make the best of their opportunities on the Sunday, while they do not seem to be preparing for the fact that in a very short time an additional challenge will be presented when the leaving age in day schools is raised to 15. It has been at the age of 14 that most scholars have been lost to Sunday Schools, and another year at the day schools will probably offer the possibility of holding them for another very critical year and gripping them for Christian service.

The scheme of Christian education printed in our last number has led to an animated discussion among those engaged in the work: it has been recognized, even by those who are convinced that the ideal it sets forth is far out of the reach of the ordinary school, as the most thoroughgoing and comprehensive yet produced. The work of the ministry, it is clear, will have to be so reorganized as to bring the duty of teacher training into the first place, and such training will have to be compulsory if the work is to be really effective. We were greatly struck last year by discovering schools in the United States—in Chicago and Los Angeles, for example—where payment was made to all the teaching staff, and by the claim made that in those schools the efficiency had increased to a tremendous extent. It is from this point of view that we have asked Professor Carl S. Patton, our American correspondent, to write the article on religious education in America that appears within.

People generally are slowly coming to realize the urgency of this matter of religious education in the day schools. The Free Churches no longer seem to have the courage or the strength of principle to say that religious teaching is not the concern of the State. Many Free Churchmen seem quite willing, while themselves objecting to pay for sectarian teaching, to make non-Christians pay for the teaching of Christianity. If there is to be religious teaching in publicly controlled schools there is, of course, every-

thing to be said for the making of agreed syllabuses, of which the Cambridgeshire is one of the most successful. We cannot but think, however, that the Free Churches generally would have impressed the general public more had they refused to take State aid for teaching the tenets of their faith and had themselves shown a willingness to make great sacrifices for the teaching of their own and other children. (This, of course, would not prevent children in the day schools learning of the English Bible and its place in English life and literature, or of the Christian Church and its place in the history of the world. These subjects could not be kept out of any satisfactory curriculum.) Our thoughts were set moving again on these lines by an American book, *Religious Education and the State* (Doubleday, Doran, $2.00), in which Dean J. K. Jackson and Professor C. M. Malmberg summarize the attitude of the different American States to religious teaching in the schools. The laws relating to Bible reading in public schools are outlined and the practice of the different States tabulated. Particulars are given of places where public school time is used for religious teaching, with or without legal sanction, and there is a most informing chapter about the recent growth of " Week-day Schools for Religious Instruction " and their relation to public education.

* * *

THE bane of ordinary religious journalism is its stress on personalities. Week after week the limelight is thrown on well-known figures, while those who work off the stage are in complete darkness. Once upon a time we were asked to write reports of the proceedings of an international religious assembly, and rejoiced in the invitation because it would give an opportunity to tell of unknown men, young and old, who had done good service. O for the foolish optimism of youth ! The reports were duly written and sent across the sea, but when they appeared in print, with cuts made to fit columns and so forth, in every case the references to unknown speakers had been judiciously cut out, throwing up the religious nabobs into even greater glory !

These pages rarely mention personalities, but three London ministries have recently concluded that will shine like stars in the Master's crown. The name of Bevill Allen was not familiar to Congregationalists all over the country, but it was enshrined in the hearts of the people of Tooting, and the scenes at his funeral showed how thirty-six years of quiet, steadfast, loyal service had impressed the community. J. Earle Morrell and William Sheers are still with us, having just laid down the work they have done at Bromley-by-Bow (22 years) and Bethnal Green (19 years) respectively. Only those who know East London and its problems, and have seen the courageous way in which these men have tackled them, can appreciate to the

full their splendid service. They will have no columns and no photographs in the religious press; they will appear on no Assembly platforms; their names will not come familiarly to men's lips. But they have their reward now in the affection of their people and their brethren, and they will enjoy it afterwards when all faithful toil receives its " Well done."

* * *

In the days of changing residences we commend the example of Thomas Foley, of whom Richard Baxter tells us that he " Placed his eldest son's habitation at Kidderminster, which became a great Protection and blessing to the Town," and so with the other two sons, " with a view to the same end: not where they could get most, but where they could give most, and do most good."

* * *

What is happening at the B.B.C.? One by one well-known officials are resigning, leaving the reason to be guessed. Perhaps these frequent changes are responsible for the remarkable difference in the standards of the programmes and in efficiency generally. Nothing could have been better than the announcement of election results on the night of 30th May, nothing worse than that on the evening of 31st May. Thousands of people, including many invalids, were awaiting the 6 p.m. announcement, with pencils and lists of the constituencies before them. But instead of giving the results in classified form, boroughs first and counties next, in alphabetical order, the announcer jumped all over the place. Why the results were not announced two or three times during the afternoon we can only conjecture: it looks very much like the influence of the millionaire proprietors of evening papers. If the results *had* to be announced all at once, some definite system should have been adopted.

* * *

We have received from New Zealand a long reply to Mr. Angus Watson's article, " The Spirit of Renunciation in Industry." This will appear in our next issue, together with Mr. Watson's rejoinder.

The next number will be of increased size, and will contain the Report of the Cambridge Conference, July 1st—4th. The subject of the Conference this year is " The Christian Conception of God." The speakers are Sir Oliver Lodge, Prof. W. R. Sorley, Principal Thomas Phillips, and many Congregationalists. Applications for membership of the Conference should be made to the Rev. E. W. Johnson, M.A., Cheshunt College, Cambridge. Orders for additional copies of the Conference number should be placed with the Independent Press immediately: the last Conference number sold out, and now copies are difficult to obtain.

THE THEOLOGY OF KIERKEGAARD.

No list, however brief, of the great types of theological construction exemplified during the past century could justly omit the name of Sören Kierkegaard. He is prophet as much as theologian; we should not be far out if we called him the religious Nietzsche. In his view of God and the world elements occur which answer to the long-drawn-out tragedy of his life; there is a brave defiance of Church convention which reveals him as at the least an exceptional man; and no one could gain the title of " the accusing angel " of contemporary theology who did not exhibit startling qualities of insight and vigour. Admittedly the most original mind Denmark ever produced, and one of her classic writers, he is distinguished in the strictest sense of the word. His influence, moreover, has been a powerful factor in the rise of the latest school or group of German theologians, that which gathers round Karl Barth. In the preface to his " Romans " Barth writes: " If I have a system, it consists in this, that I always keep in mind as far as possible what Kierkegaard described as the endless qualitative difference between time and eternity, alike in its negative and its positive meaning. God is in heaven and you are on earth." Traces of the older thinker may perhaps also be found in Barth's decidedly cool and critical attitude towards Church life as such, for the final act in Kierkegaard's life-drama was an impassioned frontal attack upon ecclesiastical Christianity as a travesty of New Testament religion.

Kierkegaard was born at Copenhagen in 1813, as the youngest son of Michael Kierkegaard, a retired woollen draper in easy circumstances; and when he died at the age of forty-two his message had been delivered. Never was a son more deeply marked by a father's influence. Over Michael's life there hung a pall of melancholy. Once, while a herd-boy on the moors, overcome by hunger, cold and loneliness, the lad had mounted a hillock and solemnly cursed God to His face, as the dispenser of a lot so wretched. Soon thereafter he took a situation in Copenhagen, which led quickly to prosperity; but with the bias to morbid introspection characteristic of him, and stern religious feeling, he took commercial success as a token that by his young curse he had committed the sin against the Holy Ghost. Constant fellowship with this dark but lofty spirit made indelible impressions on the boy Sören. A weakly child, he spent an unnaturally quiet youth, his one recreation, as he himself relates, being to listen, as together they walked up and down the dining-room, to his father's unbelievably graphic description of imaginary journeys. In these circumstances a congenital melancholy marked him for its own; it was, as he puts it, the price of being exceptional. This inner gloom

for the most part lay concealed under an appearance of ironical good spirits.

His student years were tempestuous; for a time he was on the verge of renouncing Christianity. Natural science meant nothing to him, but only problems of the spirit. He plunged into Romanticism, Hegel, Greek Philosophy; most of all he brooded over Socrates, aware from the first that the Greek sage and he belonged together. His graduating thesis had as subject "The Concept of Irony, with special reference to Socrates." It contains some ideas prominent in his later work, such as the infinite and eternal meaning of personality; also in part it illustrates the peculiar method he was ultimately to adopt of setting forth his message by way of "indirect communication." As one writer has expressed it: "He fabricates characters representative of various aspects of stages of contemporary life, letting each work out his own views." As a method it is essentially poetical, recalling now and then Browning and his "Dramatic Lyrics." When Kierkegaard puts his own name as editor on the title-page of these pseudonymous books, he means to intimate that they more or less express something like his own view. And parallel to these went a series of works openly acknowledged in the usual way.

Shortly before the end, his dying father had confided to him some dark and guilty secret of his own past. The effect of the disclosure, whatever it may have been, was to awaken in the youth a resolve to devote all his powers to the defence of authentic Christianity in what he felt to be a semi-pagan world. Then came a second crisis. In 1843 he was betrothed to a young girl of Copenhagen, and broke the engagement—and we may believe also his own heart—after a year of tragic conflicts with himself. So profound was his sense of guilt at parting with Regine Olsen, whom then and always later he held in unqualified honour, that, although convinced no way of escape was open, he thenceforth lived the life of a penitent, weighed down yet sharply challenged by the feeling that he was not as other men. He must give himself to the crusade against unbelief. If this should mean that he perished in the fray, that too befitted his guilty but dedicated lot. He was to be a "Solitary," called from above to show his age "what it is to be a Christian." If his life was thus cast amid a generation deaf to the imperatives of religion, he must cry aloud and not spare. Truth, he was learning, has no significance except for the temper of inwardness and subjectivity; we have to face the Divine as lonely souls charged with an individuality no man can share, and in that character we must place ourselves unreservedly in God's hand for obedience, if need be for rejection and annihilation.

Two remarks of a preliminary kind are here in place. First, it is impossible to overlook the emphasis uniformly laid by Kierkegaard on this principle of spiritual inwardness. Inwardness is the name by which he designates the appropriation, with grave and personal

passion, of what has been intellectually given. Truth, as he puts it, is subjectivity, and subjectivity is truth; the vital thing is not the *what* of belief, but the *how*. In words that have been often quoted: "Only the truth that edifies is truth for thee." Yet by thus making truth and inwardness equivalent terms, he has no thought of suggesting that truth is wholly immanent in the human mind, without a trans-subjective correlate, the degree of "truth" consisting simply in the degree of warmth attaching to religious emotion; what he means to convey is that religious insight is higher and more veracious in proportion as it releases the "infinite passion" whereby the right relation of man to God comes to be realized. The subjectivity of "religion without an object" is abhorrent to a mind so tragically grave. But he desires to bring out the futility and emptiness of two kinds of objectivity. The one is the cold objectiveness of speculative divinity, which dissolves the Gospel in ideas, wipes out the unique Incarnation in Jesus Christ, robs the world of its supreme religious authority, and, in consequence, can scarcely fail to shirk the solemn task of summoning men to make up their minds for God. The other is the tepid objectivity of conventional Church life, which makes terms of peace with the world, and replaces personal concern about eternity by decent membership of an institution. For Kierkegaard to insist that subjectivity is truth is to recall men to the fact that religion, to live at all, must live in the heart, the conscience, the innermost chambers of the soul. Bare unappropriated fact is worthless; in piety everything must be the man's living possession. Luther and Pascal had said the same thing long before, as we all know; and now Kierkegaard said it afresh. He said it with amazing power, but we shall later see how by his extravagant manner of saying it he became involved in grave difficulties over the idea of historical revelation.

Secondly, we ought to note his thoroughgoing distrust of the Hegelian philosophy. He is constantly urging that philosophy and Christian religion are incompatible, and that it will pass the wit of man to bridge the gulf between them. What Christianity asks a man is: Wilt thou be made whole? Philosophical idealism, on the other hand, taking as it has always done a frivolous view of sin, recoils with distaste from a question so intrusive, betraying thus the fact that what it wants is not radical cure, but at most a theoretic interpretation. "A man can only become a Christian," Kierkegaard rejoins, "by a leap of despair." To escape from life's need and danger we must renounce all claims, whether of understanding or will, and cast ourselves, blindly and unreservedly, on the grace of God. What particularly roused his anger was the Hegelian notion that all contradictions of thought can be ironed out in a higher synthesis, the dialectical process going forward smoothly from point to point. Martensen, whose *Christian Dogmatics* later came to

be widely known in English-speaking lands, was an eloquent advocate of this principle; but for him and all his works Kierkegaard had nothing but detestation. On this commonplace but pretentious person, as he regarded him, he poured a vitriolic stream of irony.

But Kierkegaard had a dialectic of his own, and one to which he attached a crucial importance. Indeed, he was accustomed to describe his thought in general terms as " a qualitative dialectic "—as an attempt, that is, to bring out absolute distinctions, to stress harsh differences, to insist upon antagonistic sides of experience which contemporary speculation was wiping out, or blurring, in a cheap and superficial reconciliation. What offended him in idealism, as we have seen, was its insatiable hunt for idyllic logical harmony. This for him constituted its shame, and the success of the attempt would be fatal to Christianity. The formula " both—and," on which Hegelianism thrives, must be replaced by " either—or." The true thinker will not try to have everything about him just a little clearer than it is; his business is to make difficulties, for religion is as far as possible from being rational. It is a contrast which he often marks by the opposed terms " system " and " existence," construed in a special sense of his own. " System " is the Hegelian philosophy, based on logic; " existence " is the real world of personal life; and the two are poles apart. In his uncompromising words: " A logical system there may be, but a system of being there can never be." Monism is the enemy. What the speculative philosopher forgets is that considerations of logic give no aid in moral crises, that it is mockery to explain to a tempted man how sin and virtue form a developing unity. In short, the Hegelian harmonist offers a caricature of the Gospel, robbing it both of awfulness and glory; whereas Kierkegaard accepts it as his life-work to reclaim for Christian faith the territory so long basely betrayed to speculation, and to preach peace with a sword. Christ is a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence.

I said a moment ago that, at least in the first years of his writing life, Kierkegaard's practice was to try out his ideas by putting them in the mouth of imaginary characters. By such " experiments in psychology " he conveyed his message indirectly. In February, 1843, appeared his book *Either—Or,* the first of an impressive series. The same year saw the publication of *Fear and Trembling* and *Repetition*, in which he elucidated some of the greater problems of religion and ethics by detailed treatment of the experience of Abraham and Job. Twelve months later he issued, again pseudonymously, a more definitely philosophical couple of books, with the titles *Philosophical Fragments* and *The Conception of Dread*—the first largely consisting of a profoundly conceived dialogue between Socrates and Christ, and centring in the question: How can eternal salvation be based on a historical event?; the second a psychological

discussion of what precisely is meant by Sin, original and actual. In 1845 appeared what some have thought the most remarkable of all his books: *Stages on the Way of Life*; and twelve months later the treatise which he himself always regarded as the crown of his life-work: *The Concluding Unscientific Postscript*—a postscript, that is, to *Philosophical Fragments*. In this last volume a full statement is offered of what, for Kierkegaard, is involved in becoming a Christian. Simultaneously, in order, as he put it, to keep in telegraphic communication with religion and to mark (if it should ever be questioned) the wholly practical intention of all his writing, he brought out under his own name no fewer than eighteen devotional addresses, deeply experimental and even passionately Christian in tone. To this day addresses of this type from his pen are being put in print.

The books I have named, all published within about four years, and containing most of what Kierkegaard stands for in theology, at once gave him fame. George Brandes, the eminent critic, is clear that there had been nothing like them in Danish prose. He comments upon Kierkegaard's ill fortune in being born in one of the minor countries of Europe; had he written in one of the greater languages, the world must have rung with his name. It is interesting to find Kierkegaard putting forward one of his own pieces as the modern counterpart of Plato's *Symposium*, and good judges have declared that the comparison can be made without absurdity. This article attempts no more than to give a general impression of the ideas he thus flung down before the world.

He begins by calling attention to the three main stages or levels at which our fellow-men can be seen to be living. First, the æsthetic stage, that of the natural man whose motto is: "*Carpe diem*, enjoy life, and with all thy getting get pleasure." It is an existence without unity or meaning, libertine by very nature, and devoid of all interest in duty or in the foundation of a home. It resembles, as he puts it graphically, a stone thrown across a pool, which keeps itself up by dancing lightly from wave to wave, but instantly sinks in darkness when the dance is over; so, by an inward necessity, the genial æsthetic life turns to damnation and despair. Once that point is reached, everything depends on how the man despairs. Let him betake himself to the finite, and nothing can save him. The æsthete in *Either—Or* clearly represents the Romantic, but there are touches of autobiography.

The second and contrasted ethical stage is a life of concrete interest, exemplified by a happy marriage. Here all is open and above-board; life is shared with others; there is a mind open to the richness and variety of human experience, there is a development of personality. The existence in which the æsthete can find nothing but tedious monotony reveals itself as crowded with beauty. It is a

life, let us not forget, which Kierkegaard himself had dreamt of living, but had put away in penitential renunciation. He had felt, as he believed, the touch of that ancient law of God which rends loving hearts asunder, and makes havoc of our plans. And yet in the martyrdom of his hopes he had discovered what is higher. Beyond ethics, he had caught sight of religion.

This, then, is the third and the loftiest stage; but by distinguishing religion so sharply from morals he has no wish at all to suggest that religion robs the ethical stage of all value. On the contrary, the religious man may well take morality as precisely the plane on which he is called to live and work, under the light of God's presence. None the less, he still insists firmly that morality is not religion, in any sense. In the simply moral life there is no problem, no conflict, no agony; the discovery has yet to be made that faith is the deepest passion and the most incredible paradox of which the human mind is capable. What faith is we see best from Abraham's story; he received the command to kill Isaac, a morally wrong act, and obeyed in virtue of his personal relationship to God. Such a relationship must always baffle reason and can be realized only by a leap of the soul. Wherever you have religion, Kierkegaard protests, you have a cross, on which human thought and happiness must be nailed with unflinching resolution. "In the power of the absurd," as he defiantly expresses it, "Abraham clung to the certitude that he would receive Isaac back again, and thereby he gained anew the whole sphere of time."

To this analogy, the experience of Abraham, he recurs over and over. He finds in it convincing proof that, in a human point of view, faith is something utterly incomprehensible and irrational. To reflexion, God is no more than a Postulate, the refuge of the man who would find life unbearable without it. As he puts it memorably: "In time, man reaches no more than a fighting certainty"; only eternity will bring something far better. And if apart from "faith" we could not bring out the temporal style of human experience, still less can we indicate the sublimeness and majesty of God. The strongest emphasis a man can lay upon himself, saying as it were to his neighbour, With me hast thou to do, is to demand that the other shall *believe in* him; and God is the sole Subject, the one Self, who in face of all the inhabitants of time can so accentuate His Ego as to say: Believe in Me. Kierkegaard nowhere claims to have been able to emulate Abraham in that movement of faith by which the patriarch regained what previously he had surrendered; when *he* lost, it was for ever. But that, he urges, is due to the weakness of his trust. "I may not have faith myself," he seems to say; "but at least I know what faith is, and I have taken it as my task to see that it is proclaimed in its unadorned rigour."

The believer, as he proceeds to argue, chiefly in the *Philosophical*

Fragments, is one who has renounced all hope of reaching what may be called a transparent view of life. So far from having solved the enigmas, faith has only begun to see what they are. It is on the believing mind alone that the real perplexities dawn. Whether regarded from within or without, faith is a pure paradox; from without, for no reasoning can bring you there; from within, for the joy that constitutes its inmost being can only come through incessantly renewed pain. Thus we arrive at the crucial problem, which we have long been making for, How to become a Christian; and it is handled in the *Concluding Postscript.*

Kierkegaard looks upon it as his mission to make the solution of this question as hard for everyone as possible. Nothing else befits the exacting genius of Christianity; and Christianity, he exclaims, must for once be set forth in the interest of God, not of man. Over against the Eternal, we men are always in the wrong. And we become Christians when we confess it unreservedly, when we win it from ourselves to say to the Supreme One: "Before Thee we are but dust and ashes." That means suffering, poignant and ever-renewed—the suffering felt by one who breaks with the life of nature; the worse pain due to consciousness of guilt. To live with God or in God is for us unnatural; its insupportable tension and pain, he declares, make the believing man like a fish flung out of its native element, far up the dry bank. In the background of this sombre and forbidding message we find Kierkegaard's fundamental theological conviction.

He sets forth this principle, from which all else derives, as the absolute dualism between God and man. They are separated, not merely distinguished, by an utter difference of quality. We have to clear our minds of the facile notion that when we speak of Divine and human, we are doing no more than indicate a quantitatively higher reality alongside of a lower; so far from that, the distinction between the two is total. To think of God as but the superlative of man is at once foolish and blasphemous. Between eternity and time, between the Infinite and the finite, there is a great gulf fixed; they are sheerly different in kind. It is a dualism no effort of ratiocination can resolve; the thing can be done only practically, by will, and even then only for a moment. Only for the twinkling of an eye, only, as it were, convulsively, can the individual rise into such a union with the Infinite as transcends all lower being. The leap of pure passion must be ventured, if the abyss is ever to be crossed. Human personality, which by nature is captive in the ceaseless tension of antithesis, escapes solely by the gateway of perpetually repeated decision for God. At every point the relative must be sacrificed to the Absolute; immolation is the one way, for in themselves the two stand wholly apart. In one of his later works a passage occurs in which the same principle is contemplated from a

slightly different point of view. Kierkegaard there is speaking of the mutually exclusive character of what is Christian and what is just naturally human, and insisting on the torture that supervenes when the man of time strives to live eternally, when the sinner stands consciously in the presence of the Holy One. He goes on to declare that in the field of time suffering is the inevitable signature and badge of the Divine love. The absolute contrast between God and man, he avers, can be put briefly in two sentences—the first: "Thou sufferest, therefore God loves thee; the second: "God loves thee, therefore thou must suffer."

I do not say that this insistence on an absolute distinction between God and man is sound, or that he would be a wise expositor who undertook to exhibit it as in harmony with the parable of the Prodigal Son. Yet we shall probably feel, all of us, that it gives us something to think about. One of the Hebrew prophets speaks words of promise for those who "tremble at the word of the Lord"; and of all such prophets Kierkegaard was a disciple. Nor can we forget that this man who spoke with apparently unmitigated harshness of the sheer distance of Eternity from time was himself a gentle-hearted preacher of the love of God. He bowed his head in presence of the mysterious paradox. There is suffering untold, but in the midst of it to be one with God is blessedness. Yet, in spite of all, we can see that so hard-driven a view of the Divine transcendence is once more trembling on the verge of that old monastic misunderstanding which looked upon the world as God-forsaken, and fled from it to the desert.

It thus appears that, altogether apart from Christianity, the relations of God and man are dark with perplexity. Man in himself is a synthesis of eternity and time; and where these two mingle there is pain, and paradox as well. But when the Gospel steps into the arena, then, argues Kierkegaard, in his eagerness to make difficulties, the darkness deepens. In two ways. To begin with, Christianity forces a man to look straight at his own unqualified sinfulness; or, to put it otherwise, it hounds him out of the petty enumeration of particular offences and confronts him starkly with sin. If before he had faced God as the finite under the shadow of the Infinite, now he kneels in his guilt before the Holy One. At long last he has discovered that sin and human nature are one, and that redemption, to be real, must be conceived as a purely miraculous new creation, a fresh beginning which breaks all continuity with the man's old self. In this situation —and here wonder presses close on the heels of wonder—it transpires that the Holy One is actually seeking fellowship with the guilty. And this brings us to the very summit. It is the essence of Christianity that eternal Truth once came forth in history, embodied in a human person—the person of the God-man. Thus Kierkegaard's fundamental doctrine of paradox concentrates itself in the Incarnation, for to him Christ is at once the object of saving faith and the

ruin of all rational thought. *Credo quia absurdum est*: the audacious words might be his own. Christianity consists of paradox. It is paradoxical that the believer should base the assurance of eternal salvation on an isolated historical fact; more emphatically still it is paradoxical that this historical fact, the person of the God-man, on which salvation rests, should not simply include but actually be constituted by a pure contradiction. For the God-man unites in Himself two elements or aspects which utterly repel each other—eternity and time, the Divine and the human. His Person is thus an extravagant and preposterous entity against which, in Kierkegaard's phrase, reason "beats its brow till the blood comes." Yet the absurdity is fact and is vital to the Gospel.

I do not mean that at this point Kierkegaard actually revels in absurdity for its own sake. Sometimes his approach to Christ is made in a different intellectual temper. Assuming that man by nature is in a condition of untruth, he can argue, as others have done before him, that the Teacher who is to set him right must not only give the truth itself, but also enable him to appropriate it by working on him a transformation of his being. And since transformation of this kind is beyond a purely human teacher, He who redeems must Himself be God. Here we are in touch with one impression Christ really does make on devout minds; but for Kierkegaard it is not enough. His statements often more than suggest that the inwardness of our personal relationship to God actually depends on our blind acceptance of an utterly insoluble Christological paradox, and that by accepting it we give the needed proof that we are ready to bear "the offence of the Cross." Sacrifice of the intellect has to be; we must simply own that while God and man are sheer opposites, in the God-man they become one. Now we may readily admit that at a certain level of thought the presence of discrepancy or antinomy may be a mark rather of depth than of shallowness; but Kierkegaard's argument is to the effect that the value of the different stages of personal religion ought to be measured by the degree of paradox each exhibits, and that at the highest point of all we believe against *every* counter-reason. We believe, that is to say, by simple defiance. To become Christians we must crucify intelligence. Reason is prostrated by the logical enormities thrust on it by the Gospel. It is surely a sad irony that the man who could write so memorably about the true inwardness of faith, urging that personal possession of truth is the one thing needful, should thus have placed a compulsory theoretic assent at the heart of religious experience. For the paradox in question, irrational though it be, is none the less theoretic. He is really sponsoring a new form of intellectualism, with a rude and desperate violence.

Other instances of sheer paradox are the forgiveness of sins and regeneration. They *are* paradoxes because man's nature is unmixed

weakness and evil, so that as it stands it reveals no point of contact for redeeming grace, which can only intervene in the shape of miraculous force. Accordingly, when God forgives sin and recreates a man in faith, He does so by breaking all continuity with the past and calling into existence what is in fact a new personality. It is hardly necessary to point out that all this is wholly inconsistent with Kierkegaard's initial principle of subjectivity or inwardness, which plainly implies that by nature man is made for truth and sensitive to its appeal. It has been well said that here two interests have to be kept in view. "On the one hand, the effect of sin on human nature, and especially on the human will, must be such that man *needs* a redeemer; on the other hand, it must only be such that he remains susceptible of redemption." Kierkegaard simply expunges the second truth, and by petulance of this kind neither theology nor religion is the gainer.

Why, then, does Kierkegaard proclaim so defiantly irrational a view of Christianity? Why fling the Gospel right in the teeth alike of reason and conscience? Why declare that the absolutely transcendent thought of God contained in the Bible not only may but must act on the mind, to use his own figure, like the all-devouring heat of a tropical sun, scorching and killing out all vegetation? In one passage he gives the answer that this is the view of Christian religion handed on to him by his father, which he has sworn to preach inexorably. There is a Gospel which is smooth and easy, and there is a Gospel which can make no concession to human frailty. Things are what they are; why then should we wish to be deceived?

So far as Christology is concerned, however, it is clear that Kierkegaard felt himself to be carrying out the traditional dogma to what he took to be its logical, if austere, issue. To say that for the reason the Person of Christ is paradox and nothing else, or that for the will Christian life is suffering and nothing else, has in each case a look of agreement with fundamental positions of the ancient Church. The doctrine of the two natures, as we find it in the Chalcedonian Creed, may at first sight appear to justify his most extreme assertions. Between the two interpretations, however, there is an important difference. It must not be forgotten that the thinkers of the early Church were consciously wrestling with a problem forced upon them by the intellectual movements of the age, and putting forth their formulas as in some degree fitted to do a measure of justice, even in the court of reason, to the religious interests of the case. But for Kierkegaard the two natures explain nothing; they are themselves the blank enigma, the sheer contradiction, whose supreme value lies, ultimately, just in its grotesqueness. Christology is the rock of offence, on which proud human thought crashes and goes to wreck. The pure irrationality of the Gospel stamps it as from God, as different from anything that could have sprung from the human

spirit. Yet even Kierkegaard, presumably, would not urge that it is our duty to accept every conceivable paradox. And where he gives deplorably little help is in guiding us to choose between the paradox we ought and the paradox we ought not to receive.

In something like the same way we may trace a dubious line of descent from certain features of Augustinianism to his view that, for the Christian, moral life consists in a torturing and sustained act of self-annihilation. With what is immediately given in human nature there is nothing to be done but kill it out; of itself it has no worth and must disappear; on no other condition can God take possession of the soul. Greek philosophy had taught an unqualified dualism of the temporal and the eternal. Kierkegaard lays hold of this, and combines it with the Augustinian doctrine of the total corruption of human nature. As a dogma, this is plainly at war with the mind of Jesus in the Gospels, as well as with our own candid moral experience; and anyone can see that in the hands of a man like Kierkegaard it might be put to dangerous uses. He had only to prolong the line of Augustinian hyperbole still further to reach the conviction that, according to Christianity, all that is naturally human is only there to be destroyed. As he affirms unambiguously in the *Postscript*, any degree of continuity, even the minimum, between what we now are and what we were, is proof that we are not in fact living in faith, and that to the miracle of regeneration we as yet are strangers.

In order to embrace Kierkegaard's main body of teaching in a single view, I have hitherto omitted all reference to the incident which led or misled him to interpret Christianity as, on its moral side, essential suffering. By some temperamental fatality, he had provoked a public controversy with a satirical weekly journal of Copenhagen. This paper for months held him up to the scorn and laughter of the city, poisoning his life with bitterness, all the more that as he felt in the hour of need his friends forsook him. By this episode, he recounts, the direct action of God opened his eyes to a deeper truth he had not as yet perceived. He now knew that suffering is the core of personal religion.

Kierkegaard's belief that to be in relation to God is to suffer is rendered more intense, we must suppose, by his exceptionally keen persuasion that religion is, as an experience, a lonely thing. To seek for company in the pilgrimage of faith, he writes at one point, is mortal sin. It is pain to stand alone in God's presence, for there we are aware that our whole life is exposed and sentenced; we know that in His eyes, as they rest upon us, the least fault is infinitely guilty. This sense of guilty pain is not abolished even by forgiveness. On the contrary, a man's newly-realized relationship to God, with its deepened responsibility, sharpens the inward anguish day by day. Pascal was right to call pain the Christian's normal state. Suffering, writes Kierkegaard in one of his most imaginative passages, is that

sea 70,000 fathoms deep, over which the believing heart is ever suspended. True, we may be reconciled with Christ, but only by taking His agony and humiliation as our own. Inwardness is good; but a Christian may keep his religion so entirely within as to be indistinguishable from a worldling. There are dangers in a faith so secluded. The world being what it is, personal Christianity means open battle. Suffering within, persecution without—these are risks from which no believer may ask to be excused. They spat upon Christ; it is what they always do; and we also must go forth to Him without the camp, bearing His reproach. Truth is truth directly in proportion to the pain it costs. Conventional Church life, indeed, and "following Christ" are wholly different things. A Christian true to type is invariably a martyr, not necessarily by a violent death, but as the object of public calumny and contempt.

We can hear the defiant notes of his voice. Christianity is something we ought neither to explain nor defend; far from our being its judges, its judgment of us is the one thing that matters. It must be so thrust upon men that they have no option but to take sides. God's truth is too majestical to abide man's questioning; He has no answer for our "Why?" Our part rather is to cast ourselves down in the dust before His awful sovereignty, as the great message thunders in our ears.

Looking back, the eye catches one or two of the more salient characteristic features of Kierkegaard's mind and temper. One is his extraordinary self-consciousness. His diary he proposed to call "The Book of the Judge." For his book, *The Concluding Postscript,* he predicts a future of great influence; it represents, as he acknowledges, a peculiar reading of Christianity, but one which in the long run is certain to prevail, even though he himself meanwhile should fall and be crushed. Nor was he wholly in error. His work and influence have in a measure been like a river flowing for a time underground, for after two generations of neglect his name to-day is again in the mouths of men, and books devoted to the discussion of his thought are appearing constantly. His rigorous and all but savage view of religion and its demands has been enthusiastically received by many to whom soft idyllic interpretations of the Gospel had become abhorrent. The great War bred a spirit by which he could be understood.

It is also to be remembered that the exaggerations in which Kierkegaard dealt so freely were often perpetrated with a clear intention. Newman was once asked why he had fallen upon Kingsley so fiercely. "Had I said these things in an ordinary tone," he replied, "no one would have taken notice. I was obliged to speak at the top of my voice." In his own view Kierkegaard supplied the needed corrective for an age of flat, craven rationalism; and under these conditions, he held, the right method is not timid impartiality, but

rather emphatic pressure, even to excess, in precisely the opposite direction. Not for him to strike the balance nicely between immanence and transcendence, between culture and the Gospel. Like a prophet he cried to his age that God is absolute and the world is evil. Yet he is less unaware than we might suppose of the value of those factors which, in the interest of his message, he ignores ruthlessly." Also he was convinced that life is an intrinsically contradictory affair, and therefore felt no temptation to waste time in working out smooth and puny reconciliations. Logic is at odds with life, thought with faith; let us face with open eyes all that this involves, and confess that to pass from reflexion to reality calls for a blind leap of the soul, a secret resolve and mysterious fiat of the will. So desperate is the leap, and such are the spiritual pains by which alone citizenship in that higher kingdom can be purchased, that no man would dare to turn Christian were he not driven forward irresistibly by the tortures of a guilty mind. He once confessed that his view of religion had little to offer children, and the avowal is significant.

His contribution to nineteenth-century thought begins with his own unique personality; for we have in him a theologian who reckoned nothing too hard to do or bear for the truth's sake. The late Dr. Grieve, of Glasgow, the one expert in Kierkegaard this country has ever had, speaks of " the pathos of his lonely life—that of a great sympathetic soul, like Isaiah or Dante—seeking a response that never came; and last, perhaps greatest, of all, the absolute self-consecration and singleness of purpose with which, in bodily and mental suffering, and in the loss of all things, he strove, both in his personal life and in his work, to realize the ideal."

The chief value of his thought appears to me to lie much less in systematic or detailed exposition of Christian belief than in the loud note of warning which he sounded for theologians as a class, and which he embroidered with an infinitely rich play of imaginative dialectic. He belongs to that type of thinkers who keenly resent all efforts to bring faith and speculative insight into harmony; and even if we feel sure, as for myself I do, that we have no choice but to make a persistent attempt to think things through and to think them together, still men of Kierkegaard's mould help us by insisting on that element in Christian experience which is none the less certain that it defies satisfactory explanation. Above all, he took pains to ensure that his age should never forget that God, the Unsearchable One, is not man. Religion has at times been debased into an attitude in which we use God, are on easy terms with Him, employ Him as a theoretical hypothesis. On this kind of thing, we may confidently affirm, Kierkegaard has said the last word. He tears into rags all religion that is utilitarian and anthropocentric. He dwells with unrivalled power on the sense of creatureliness that over-

masters us as we worship and stops every mouth before God. He brings home, with singular force, those factors in life which oblige us to own the sovereignty of God in its sublimest form. To this he adds impressively the truth that God is holy and we are sinful—sinful not because we are finite, but because we have pushed the will of God aside, and done it to His face. We need not say that this is the whole of Biblical truth, but he who fails to see in the Bible something of which Kierkegaard's strong words are an index, appears to me to read with a veil upon his eyes.

None the less it is impossible not to feel that his powerful efforts to redress the balance of Christian thought have been of so violent and excessive a kind as to induce new distortions of truth which gravely imperil the Christian revelation of God. His individualism, to take one example, is of a type so extreme as in part to disqualify him as an interpreter of actual religious life. There is no sense, he declares roundly, in which faith can pass from one life to another. Fellowship counts for nothing here; the Church, even the family, save in the most external fashion, has not a word to say. The knight of faith rides out on a lonely quest. Whatever its momentary impressiveness, this, if taken seriously, is a caricature of New Testament religion.

Thinkers to whom the social aspects of religion are uninspiring are apt to disparage also the historical. Kierkegaard held with Emerson that nothing in faith is to be learnt from history; the single isolated soul must rather dig deep into its own experience. He had no doubt that God was in Christ; he could trace a providential guidance in his own career; but to any great movement throughout the generations he was, for the most part, wilfully blind. To his lonely spirit the prophetic reading of history brought no conviction. History, he protests, in no sense reveals God; its meaning is hidden from us, and if it has a meaning, none but God can know it. He will not see the Kingdom of God looming through the past, beckoning into the future, triumphant at last as the only enduring result of time. Two things only he can see—the human heart and the God-man.

We are justified, I think, in concluding that in the mind of Kierkegaard two conceptions of God—as also of the Christian's relation to God—were at war, which it is impossible to reconcile, not because we cannot see how to combine them, but because we see quite clearly they cannot be combined. On the one hand is the thought of God as " Holy Love "—a thought evoked by the life and achievement of Christ and confirmed by religious experience to this day; on the other is a conception totally different in origin, which makes the attribute " love " a purely formal characteristic, involving for its objects pain and even torture. We may well affirm an infinite qualitative difference between God and man, if what is in our minds

is the vast distinction of guilty sin and the majesty of grace; but what Kierkegaard too often presents is a purely metaphysical contrast between Eternity and time, between a featureless Absolute Substance and the nothingness of man. As between God and man, thus defined, there can be no union and communion of the kind known as personal fellowship; and it is not surprising that, in his attempts to force it, Kierkegaard not seldom is driven to picture man's approach or assimilation to God as tantamount to the dissolution of personality in the boundless Whole. The harshest figures are used to set forth the influence of Christianity on human life. It embitters our lot in the extreme, we are told, for the relationship of a believing man to God is a slow torment that destroys our nature and extinguishes joy. In this mood, he can even speak of forgiven sonship as only a vestibule leading into the Christian life, but in itself not specifically Christian; can describe the Gospel unintelligibly as not invitation but pure demand; can set forth the religious man's moral task not as the conquest of sin and the hallowing of will in fellowship with God, but exclusively as the mortification of nature; and can argue that it is only possible for man to possess God by moments, so that, to escape annihilation, he must for ever be seeking relief in the finite. If this be true, it is difficult to understand why such essential suffering, due to the sheer unqualified contrast between God and man, should not last for ever.

It is unnecessary to labour the point that by taking this road, which at times appeared to Kierkegaard the nobler, we lose the Fatherhood of God all over again, and deliberately avert our eyes from the revelation given by One who was both Son of Man and Son of God. This, in the old words, is to make sad those whom the Lord has not made sad. But men commonly are more Christian than their explicit creed; and we have no reason to doubt that, in his tragic solitude of spirit, Kierkegaard spoke the simple truth when he said that the certainty of God's fatherly love in Christ was for him " the archimedean point " of faith. Under his theology we may fitly inscribe the words of Pascal: " In great men everything is great—their faults as well as their merits."

H. R. Mackintosh.

THE WILBERFORCE OF AFRICA.

ALMOST exactly a hundred years ago the Magna Charta of the Hottentots, known as Ordinance No. 50, was promulgated. Not only did that Ordinance mark an epoch in the history of the coloured people of South Africa, it also had a direct effect upon the affairs of the European colonists as well. Up till 1828 the position of the Hottentots was virtual serfdom; to-day they have economic and political rights similar to those enjoyed by Europeans.

The man who, more than any other, is responsible for having secured this large freedom for the coloured people is Dr. John Philip, of the London Missionary Society. Few white men in South Africa have been more hated than he, and yet few have rendered more signal service to the whole country. The attitude that Philip adopted in regard to the Hottentots brought him into conflict with the Government on the one hand, and, much more acutely, with the white colonists on the other hand. To-day, three-quarters of a century after his death, he remains the best hated missionary who ever worked at the Cape. Generations of young white South Africans have been brought up to detest his memory, until it has become anathema. The two best-known missionary names in South Africa are those of Livingstone and Philip; the one universally honoured, the other almost as widely execrated.

The detestation in which Philip was held may be gauged from the fact that the odium was extended to all the missionaries of his Society, and the L.M.S. has the distinction of being the only Missionary Society that has ever been definitely legislated against, for after the Boers had trekked out of the Cape and founded the Transvaal Republic, they were careful to put a clause into their Constitution that stated "The people prefer not to have members of the London Missionary Society working amongst them." The hostility of mind towards missionary work in South Africa, which is not infrequently found even now, derives from this colonial bias against one man—John Philip. The *South African Outlook* of 1st March, 1928, represents the Prime Minister, General Hertzog, as saying, "The people of South Africa had for long in the past looked on the missionaries of South Africa as a contemptible class of persons who should not be here," and that "the same sort of feeling may be aroused again."

Philip is alleged to have played on the susceptibilities of ill-informed Evangelicals in England to thwart the plans of the men on the spot in South Africa, who alone knew how to treat the coloured labourer. He has been maligned as the man who got the better of the Colonists by manœuvring the Exeter Hall Group. It is high time this hoary legend was examined.

By great good fortune two or three large packing cases crammed full of letters and memoranda of Dr. Philip came recently into the hands of Professor W. M. Macmillan, Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford, and Professor of History in the University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. Professor Macmillan has sifted this mass of material and has published the result of his researches in one of the most important books[1] on South African affairs which has appeared for a long time, and incidentally has given a complete vindication of Philip, who is shown to be one of the most clear-sighted and statesmanlike servants Africa has yet had, and certainly the greatest South African of his day. Professor Macmillan says in so many words, " Had Philip's advice been taken a century ago South Africa would have been a far happier and more prosperous country than it is to-day." Instead of the picture of the unfair wire-puller, Philip is presented as a man of strong convictions, tremendously in earnest, and fearless in his defence of the underdog. He was the one man of his time who saw South Africa as a whole. The colonists, engrossed in the struggle for existence, were scarcely in a position to view the Hottentot question in an impartial fashion; they were interested parties. Philip and his missionary colleagues, on the contrary, had no axe to grind and they were able to view the situation without bias and to bring to the attention of English people the facts in regard to the oppressed Hottentot.

John Philip, born at Kirkcaldy in 1775, was one of that small band of indomitable Scots that included Moffat, Livingstone, and Mackenzie, whose work so profoundly influenced the course of events in South Africa. Before entering the ministry, Philip was in commerce in Dundee, and when only 20 years of age was works manager in a power mill. Something of his social passion was revealed when he threw up his position and prospects because he would not "sanction or be privy to" the conditions of labour to which children were subjected. That was 40 years before the first Factory Act was passed. Not long afterwards he entered Hoxton Academy to train for the ministry, and in due time became Minister at Newbury, Berks., and later of George Street Congregational Church, Aberdeen. During these years he identified himself with the advocacy of missionary work.

In 1818, after receiving the degree of D.D. from Columbia University, he was invited to become General Superintendent of L.M.S. work in South Africa. Communication between England and the Cape was so slow and irregular that it was felt essential to have someone on the spot with large executive powers, and Philip arrived at Cape Town in February, 1819, to take up his duties. For 32 years he lived a life of amazing activity, and during that period

[1] *The Cape Colour Question* (Faber & Gwyer, 21s.). Reviewed by Lord Olivier in the *C.Q.*, VI. 115.

fought to a successful issue the battle for the rights of the coloured people.

On his arrival Philip found that the primitive Bushmen, regarded by the Colonists as wild animals to be shot at sight, had been wiped out. The Hottentots or "Coloured People," in whose veins flowed the mingled blood of black or brown slaves and white Colonists, were, however, present in great number. They were at that time almost the only natives at the Cape, for the Bantu, or "natives" of to-day, had not then come as far South as Cape Colony. The white farmers, whether British or Boer, regarded these coloured people as their natural servants, but found one almost insuperable obstacle.

The Hottentots were nomads, a stage higher in evolution than the Bushmen, in that they had some kind of loose tribal organization and in that they had domesticated cattle, but they were wanderers, unaccustomed to long-continued residence in one place, and unsuited to prolonged toil. Children of the veld, they had not yet risen to the agricultural stage, nor was it in them to become labourers on the Colonists' farms. Their unreliability as workers, their sudden departure from a farm because they grew tired of toil or because the veld called them, provided the farmers with a pretext for a series of repressive measures that were intended to reduce the Hottentots to economic dependence as well as for the introduction of slave labour.

The South African attitude in regard to slavery was very different from that of England. Slavery was regarded at the Cape as respectable and even as compatible with Christianity, the Dutch Colonists, in particular, holding that the natives were intended by Providence to be hewers of wood and drawers of water for the white man. A popular couplet expressed the prevailing attitude:—

> "We are the chosen people: look at the hue of our skins.
> Others are black and yellow: that is because of their sins."

Moreover, South Africa was too remote to be reached by the currents of humanitarianism that were flowing in the thought and life of Europe, and when the slave trade was abolished in 1807 the Colonists received the news with distinct disapproval. As far as they could see the only result of the drying-up of the stream of slaves was that there was a shortage of labour which grew more acute every year. Anxious for the future, they turned to the Hottentots as possible but poor substitutes for the slaves, and determined to curb their vagrancy and force them into steady work. Hence at the very time when Europe was clarifying its thought on the moral issues involved in slavery, the Hottentots were being thrust back to a condition of serfdom, which had many of the evils and few of the mitigating circumstances of slavery. The slaves were property, and were kept in good condition by their owners as all other property would be, but the Hottentots had not this advantage: their position

was pitiable. They were a yellow-skinned people of poor physique, pastoralists of a sort, who grew no crops, and eked out a miserable but masterless existence with game, roots, and berries. Already driven off their ancestral lands by the white man, they were now to be forced into servitude to their supplanters.

This was the state of affairs that Philip found when he arrived at the Cape in 1819. In three years' time we find him writing to the Secretary of the L.M.S. in England: "I aim at one object . . . in what way I can most certainly and effectually secure the emancipation of the poor natives from their dreadful thraldom, the Missions from the oppressive system they are groaning under, and to give permanency to the cause of God in South Africa." [1] Coming from a country in which thought on the emancipation issue was relatively progressive, Philip soon found himself at variance with the Colonists, and before long he was collecting evidence of harsh treatment of Hottentots. Finding that this promised to be an interminable task, he passed from cases of individual hardship to the causes underlying them.

His position as General Superintendent of L.M.S. work in South Africa gave him unusual facilities for gathering data and forming judgments: it also brought him into close and constant touch with Government officials. A sensible, middle-aged Scotsman, he was not greatly swayed by sentiment; rather he was a man of shrewd judgment and sound views, though obstinate and humourless. If he felt that a principle was involved or native rights were in question, he was adamant.

Though the acknowledged champion of the Hottentots, Philip was not anti-Colonist, in spite of the popular estimate to the contrary. He saw South African problems steadily and saw them as a whole. It was the Colonist and not Philip who was partial and partisan. The former was necessarily an interested party, and it was hardly possible for him to view the position and rights of the Hottentots without bias. He wanted labour—labour plentiful, regular and cheap, and he was so absorbed in securing it that he could give no attention to abstract questions of right and wrong. With an impatient gesture he brushed aside all such academic considerations. He held that there were Hottentots enough to provide all the labour needed, but they were vagrant and lazy, and must therefore be made immobile and industrious. Philip, on the other hand, was completely disinterested. He saw that a prosperous and progressive South Africa could not be reared upon a foundation of servile labour. He was not anti-Colonist, but pro-South African; he might almost be claimed as the first South African. And if he was frequently found in opposition to the Colonists it was because he felt that they were

[1] *Cape Colour Question*, p. 139.

depriving the Hottentots of rights to which they were entitled. His passion for the underdog and his fearless pertinacity made him a formidable fighter and won him the undeserved reputation of being anti-Colonist.

Nor was Philip anti-Dutch. Reactionary clauses in the Fundamental Law of the Transvaal Republic (1858) have fostered the modern notion that all South African Dutch stood for the innate inferiority of the natives; and it has been too readily assumed that a progressive native policy is a characteristic British virtue. The facts are that some of the Cape Dutch held liberal views on the treatment of the Hottentots, while some of the British settlers cared only for restriction and compulsion. Philip was not anti-Dutch or anti-Colonist, but anti-oppressor.

Nor was Philip anti-Government. Sir Rufane Donkin, the acting Governor at the Cape, was his close and personal friend. When he had been in Africa two years Philip wrote: "I have a plate at the Governor's table every day, but seldom dine with him more than once a week, and I always prefer dining with him when he is alone. . . . He honours me with the appellation of friend."[1] And during the early years of his life in South Africa Philip's relations with the Government were cordial. When, however, the Commission of Enquiry was sent out from England, the evidence that Philip laid before it earned for him the bitter hostility of the new Governor, Lord Charles Somerset. The Government, Philip said, was a military Government; it was autocratic and did not reflect the wishes of the people; it curbed the freedom of the press; and was reactionary in its Hottentot policy. Lord Charles replied by denouncing Philip in a despatch to London as "formerly a journeyman weaver, now head of a Missionary Society at the Cape, and calling himself *Doctor* Philip," and asserting that he was the source of all the Government's troubles.

But though Philip was neither anti-Colonist nor anti-Dutch nor anti-Government, he yet earned the hostility of all three groups by his stubborn and pertinacious advocacy of Hottentot rights.

After a few years spent in collecting data, Philip turned to the search for underlying principles and to the formulation of definite aims. As a Christian missionary his attitude towards the Hottentots differed fundamentally from that adopted by most of the Colonists. This fact lies at the root of the loathing connected with Philip's name and policy. The Colonists regarded the Hottentot merely as a servant, Philip regarded him as a man; they regarded him as a producer only, he as a consumer also; they as a part of the necessary equipment of a farm, he as a citizen in embryo; they as a means to an end, the end being their own profit, he as an end in himself. Such

1 *Cape Colour Question*, p. 123.

diametrically opposed views held, on the one hand, by a group of determined men fighting for their livelihoods, and, on the other hand, by a strong and fearless man fighting for a depressed and inarticulate people, made a clash almost inevitable.

In his Hottentot policy Philip had three objectives : legal equality, economic freedom, and social opportunity.

He had not been long in South Africa before he found abundant evidence of legal inequality as between Hottentot and Colonist. In the eyes of the law, which should be colour blind, the Hottentots were an inferior class. On complaint against a Hottentot servant of laziness or impertinence—two highly characteristic " offences " in South Africa—the field-cornet, who was a farmer among farmers, had power to inflict corporal punishment without the formality of a trial. In the evidence of the landdrost of Uitenhage before the Crown Commissioners it was stated that " The landdrost may imprison and punish Hottentots at his discretion, whereas he cannot legally imprison and much less punish a burgher without a decree of the Court of Justice." [1] It is easy to see that when the Colonist is both judge and defendant, the Hottentot is likely to fare badly. The notorious " Black Circuit " brought to light case after case of crimes of violence on the part of farmers against their Hottentot servants. The Government order for an enquiry was bitterly resented, not so much because they were afraid of what the enquiry would disclose, as because it assumed that black and white were entitled to equal treatment in the eyes of the law. Mrs. Anna Steenkamp, writing not in the heat of the controversy, but years afterwards, expressed the view of the Dutch farmers : " It is not so much their (*i.e.*, the slaves') freedom that drove us to such lengths, as their being placed on an equal footing with Christians, contrary to the laws of God, and the natural distinction of race and religion, so that it was intolerable for any decent Christian to bow down beneath such a yoke." [2]

From the Colonists' point of view the prime offence of the Hottentots was their vagrancy, and it is obvious that farm work cannot be carried on if the farm servants walk off at the merest whim or whenever they feel the call of the wild. The aim of the farmers therefore was to make labour immobile by curbing the wanderlust of the workers. From the Hottentot's point of view the white man's demand for regular work was unintelligible. Since they were nomads vagrancy was the law of their life.

In order to secure the labour they needed for their farms the Colonists proceeded to enact a series of laws, the object of which was to check vagrancy and to force the Hottentots into their service.

The Pass Law enacted that no Hottentot should move about the country without a pass, and a Hottentot failing to produce his pass

[1] *Ibid*, 6. 157.
[2] *Ibid*, p. 81.

to any European who cared to demand it could be apprehended as a vagrant. Shortly afterwards a system of apprenticeship was sanctioned by which Hottentot children might be apprenticed from their eighth to their eighteenth years. The apprenticing of one child after another in a Hottentot family had the effect of tying the whole family to the farm for many years. The result of these and other Vagrancy Laws was to make it practically impossible for a Hottentot to change his job or seek another employer. The fluidity of labour was restricted and the standards were kept low and depressed.

It was this infringement of the Hottentots' right to freedom of movement that Philip set himself to fight. He recognized this to be the chief single barrier to their progress. " Tell me in one sentence what you want for the Hottentots ", asked Mr. William Huskisson, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. " I require nothing for the Hottentots," replied Philip, " but the power of bringing their labour to a fair market." " That," Huskisson immediately added, " includes everything else."

Again with a view to the needs of their own farms, the Colonists endeavoured to scatter the Hottentots thinly over the whole country. Philip, on the other hand, saw that the only hope for the advancement of the Hottentots lay in gathering them together in areas where they could live their own life, develop on their own lines, and be under the best and most helpful influences. He recognized that they were utterly unprepared for the full impact of white life; and its onrush was destroying all the sanctions that supported their moral code, and was rendering them bewildered, self-distrustful and decadent. The policy of the farmers was likely to be as morally damaging to the Hottentots as it would be economically futile in the long run for the whites. Philip affirmed that it was to the advantage of South Africa to have contented, prosperous, and advancing Hottentots. They were, or might be, consumers as well as producers; they should be helped and encouraged to make progress; to this end they must be freed from absolute economic dependence upon the white man, liberated from everything that tied them to the soil, and encouraged to live their own community life. Long in advance of his time Philip advocated the setting aside of areas reserved for Hottentot use. He was the first segregationist.

As a step towards this Philip developed the policy, pursued by Vanderkemp, of Institutions. Here under missionary influence and protection the Hottentots enjoyed freedom and opportunity such as they had nowhere else. If only the advice of this far-seeing man had been accepted and the segregation policy adopted before the Bantu tribes came in overwhelming numbers into South Africa, and before the white man pressed further north, the whole course of South African life would have run more smoothly and more prosperously. Professor Macmillan writes: " His policy was that these backward

people should be firmly fixed in homes and on lands of their own. With a secure home base, they might well have provided all that was needed in the way of a reserve of labour, without being wholly and utterly dependent on their chances of wage-earning alone; and modern South Africa might have escaped the clogging of its prosperity and the complication of its social life by the dispersal through the farms, towns, and dorps alike of a great mass of landless and homeless, poorly equipped and helpless unskilled labourers."

After nearly ten years of strenuous service in South Africa, Philip came on a visit to London. Finding almost colossal ignorance of South African affairs in England, he traversed the country from end to end, speaking, preaching, and interviewing people. He also found time to write, at great haste, a two-volume book, *South African Researches,* into which he put all his pent-up fervour as well as the cold logic of facts. The book had a marked effect. It strengthened the somewhat hesitant support which the Missionary Society had hitherto given him, it gave greatly added power to the anti-slavery group of Evangelicals who made wide use of the material it provided, and it brought the Government to the definite decision to issue the 50th Ordinance with full authority. On 17th July, 1828, the Ordinance was promulgated and 30,000 Hottentots were confirmed in their legal freedom, and from that day to this they have been equal in citizen rights with others within Cape Colony.

The effects of Philip's fight may be judged from the following extract from the L.M.S. Report for 1829. The words there printed are not set down by an admirer anxious to applaud a hero: they represent the thoughts of a Board of Directors not always friendly to Philip's plans.

The Directors were assured: " That it being the fixed determination of His Majesty's Government that the native inhabitants of the Cape should enjoy, in their persons, property, and possessions, freedom and the full protection of the laws, the King's commands to that effect have been conveyed to the Governor of the Colony." This assurance was followed by an Order from His Majesty in Council, " with a copy of which the Directors have been kindly furnished, and by which they are happy to inform the Society, it is trusted, that the rights and privileges of the Hottentots, and other Aborigines of South Africa, are now placed on a secure and permanent footing, being recognized as of the same nature with those of His Majesty's other subjects in that country. Had the Society been enabled to effect nothing more for South Africa than to accomplish this most desirable consummation, it would not have existed or laboured in vain. Dr. Philip will now return to his important post with a high degree of satisfaction, and will be remembered for ages to come as the friend of Africa and the liberator of the Hottentots; while, by the Divine blessing upon the exertions of the Society, we trust that its

stations, both within and beyond the Colony, will present, in future years, a more cheering and encouraging prospect than they have ever yet done."

That was written a century ago. It is time to revive the name of Philip and the memory of the gallant effort he made for liberty that the Kingdom of God might have free course in Africa. Philip was a great and distinctive personality. For thirty-two years (1819-1851) he toiled unceasingly, travelling, organizing, writing, and thinking. He met with that bitter and unrelenting opposition that men always offer when they think their livelihood is threatened; he was forced to fight a libel action; he was dubbed " enemy of the people." Yet nothing deflected him from his course. His courage never failed. He bore adversity better than popularity, and, like his spiritual ancestors, " he feared not the face of man." There are few of whom the L.M.S. and Congregationalism have better reason to be proud. Professor Macmillan's book is a valuable corrective of the very common South African attitude which criticizes Philip, not because his methods were wrong, but because they touched the white man's pocket, because he preferred the love of justice to "colour solidarity."

The fact is that John Philip not only fought a fierce fight for the Hottentots, but also showed South Africa and the whole world one of the most hopeful and modern methods of dealing with the Colour question. On the comparatively narrow field of the old Cape Colony, when the Bantu were still outside the Cape frontier, the status of the degraded Hottentot was so improved that he was set on the path that is raising him from the rude barbarian, whose degradation was a general menace, to the Eurafrican who is now becoming a useful citizen and making his own contribution to the national well-being. He led a despised and depressed people out of bondage into a land of promise and opportunity.

John Philip needs no whitewashing; he needs only to have the mud scraped off. Professor Macmillan has done that, and has presented the figure of a fearless, far-seeing statesman, a little wanting in humour and inclined to be dictatorial at times, but in every real sense the greatest South African of his day. He saw South Africa as a unit. In the days when civilization barely reached the Orange River he dreamed of a great, free, and progressive Commonwealth whose Christian spirit and just traditions would spread to all the Continent. His rightful place is in the forefront of the makers of Africa.

But he was not only a statesman. Like those brother Scots, Livingstone and Mackenzie, who served Africa under the ægis of the L.M.S., he could not separate his politics from his religion. Like them also he was first and foremost a missionary. It was the moral issues involved in the Hottentot that gripped him, and that he forced upon the attention of the world. He fought for the Hottentots

because he held that in God's view they were worth saving. It was something more than an economic or political motive that urged him on; the motive was religious. He believed in the Hottentots, and the events of the century have justified his faith. He has shown that there are no inherently inferior races of mankind. Few people could have had a worse start than the Hottentots Philip found in South Africa when he landed there in 1819; yet they have made good, and the name Hottentot is now no longer used.

The fight that Philip fought is still going on in Africa from Kenya to the Cape, with the Bantu in place of the Hottentots. If Philip's life and work mean anything they mean that White advance cannot be built on Black degradation. White Africa must carry its child races along with it on the way of progress, for no civilization based on Black servitude can hope to live. The future is safe only as it stands by those principles of freedom which, wherever they have been tried, have not been found wanting.[1]

A. M. CHIRGWIN.

1 Since this article was written, two extremely important books have been published. Prof. Macmillan's researches into Philip's papers have produced another volume, *Bantu, Boer and Briton: The Making of the South African Native Problem* (Faber and Gwyer, 21s.), in which the final verdict on Philip is thus delivered (p. 307):

> "Of *DR. JOHN PHILIP'S personal share in all these doings,* it may now be said that all the evidence finally contradicts the tradition that Dr. Philip had a meddlesome itch for 'intrigue' and interference. At a great many points his interference was important and effective. But in every instance he delayed, usually till the scandal was too great to permit him to keep silent, always till he had first-hand knowledge on which to base his representations. . . .
>
> "It need not now be stressed that his vision of what was required went far beyond 'Dr. Philip's Treaty States,' for which he has been so much censured. He tried to make the best of the 'Treaty States,' but they were none of his originating. On the whole he did more and saw further than any contemporary, and a little more 'interference' on these last two questions (the Transvaal and Kafirland) might have been of inestimable service."

Prof. Macmillan's two books are indispensable to a knowledge of the subject. The other book is Lord Olivier's *White Capital and Coloured Labour* (Hogarth Press, 12s. 6d.), nominally a revised edition of a book published in 1906, but really quite a new book. It is dedicated to "African peoples, from members of whose races the author has learnt much of the nature of man."—ED.

THE MODERN PREACHER AS POET.

That the ancient preacher of righteousness was often a poet is obvious to any thoughtful reader of the Old Testament or student of ancient faiths. Much of the prophetic message that rang in the ears of the people of Israel was exquisitively beautiful in the wording and phrasing which was its vehicle. As Miss Maude Royden says in *Beauty in Religion*: "When you hear a verse like this: *If with all your hearts ye truly seek Him, ye shall ever surely find Him,* it is partly the beauty of the words that penetrates the mind with conviction. It is not only an assurance of fact; it is that the extraordinary beauty of the form makes us know it is true, because if it were not true, it could not be beautiful, since what is false is always ugly, and what is true is beautiful."

Sometimes we recognize a poem complete in itself, and with a definite theme running through it, but more often we can only say that the writer is using poetic language. His thoughts run on themes which could only adequately be expressed by figurative language and symbolism. It is this poetic element, and our downright literalism of interpretation, which has spoiled our understanding of much of that great collection of writings which we call the Old Testament.

Since to understand a poem requires something of the spirit of a poet, may I put in a plea that the preacher of to-day shall not fear to regard himself as a poet, and even venture to suggest that without such poetic instinct he cannot be fully equipped to interpret the ways of God to men? It is not merely that without this he fails to understand the old prophets; still more, he fails to understand God.

> Trees in their blooming,
> Tides in their flowing,
> Stars in their circling,
> Tremble with song.
> God on His throne,
> Is eldest of Poets,
> Unto His measures
> Moveth the whole.[1]

The universe shows marvellous examples of repetition and rhythm, and surely it is these qualities which underlie all poetry. Few are rash enough to try to define poetry, but most of us would agree with Iolo A. Williams[2]: "We are I think in a position to say, not only that there is an essential distinction between the two forms of writing (*i.e.*, prose and poetry), but also that this lies in the element of repetition which is present in all poetry. Sometimes the repetition is of sounds as in rhymed or alliterative verse, sometimes of rhymes as in blank and other unrhymed verses; usually there is a combination of both kinds of repetition. But the repetition must be there for

1 William Watson.
2 *Poetry To-day.*

a piece of writing to be poetry. There must be an arrangement of the words so planned as to bring about at more or less regular intervals, the re-iteration of certain recognizable units, whether those units be combinations of the sounds of vowels and consonants, or of stressed and unstressed syllables. Whatever the nature of the unit of repetition, it must be there, and must contribute to the impression created by the composition as a whole."

To tell men about God, His messenger must have words that fit his theme, and insight to appreciate the mighty purpose of God. The New Testament writers were for the most part plain men, of no great learning, yet some touch of poetic fire seems to have come to them as the Spirit of God entered their lives, helping them to choose beautiful passages from the old scriptures and weld them into their gospel narrative, fixing upon the similies and metaphors which were required, and observing that restraint which permits a writer to suggest much in a few brief words and yet leave much to the imagination of his readers. " Every man went unto his own house; Jesus went unto the Mount of Olives." There in a brief sentence you get the authentic touch of a poet hand that by way of simple contrast speaks to our hearts and minds.

The modern man thinks that he has little time or desire for poetry, and for the most part he does not read it, which is his great loss. Often he fails to appreciate it because it is presented to him in such large quantities. Faced with a poem like *In Memoriam* or *The Lady of the Lake,* he feels that a task awaits him, whereas a small and exquisite verse, read with insight and feeling, usually compels his interest.

The preacher has the greatest theme of all to announce to men, and he is often asked to tell it in good plain English, to deliver a simple Gospel sermon, a straight call to action. People who listen to a Gospel always in prose will miss much of its essence, for it takes a poet to make it reach the heart and imagination of men. In Milton's *Apology for Smectymnus* he says: " I was confirmed in this opinion, that he who would not be frustrate of his hope to write well hereafter in laudable things, ought himself to be a true poem." It is not unreasonable to extend his thought to that man who covets to speak well in laudable things.

This is not to imply that it is easy to be a poet: Francis Thompson describes him well:—

He lives detachéd days;
He serveth not for praise;
For gold
He is not sold.
He asketh not world's eyes;
Nor to world's ears he cries—
Saith, these
Shut, if ye please!

It does not follow that the modern preacher is to write poetry—though a considerable number of eminent preachers do so, and it would be safe to say that most ministers have tried. It would harm no man to attempt to write poetry, provided that he did not feel it necessary to inflict it too often upon congregations or friends. He will not find it easy, and may even come to agree with W. B. Yeats:—

> I said, A line will take us hours maybe;
> Yet if it does not seem a moment's thought,
> Our stitching and unstitching has been naught.
> Better go down upon your marrow-bones
> And scrub a kitchen pavement, or break stones
> Like an old pauper, in all kinds of weather,
> For to articulate sweet sounds together
> Is to work harder than all these.

And yet every man who is called to preach the Gospel has this longing to say something which is too big and yet too simple to say. As G. K. Chesterton puts it in "The Three Wise Men":—

> We walk bewildered in the light,
> For something is too large for sight,
> And something much too plain to say.

The preacher feels inarticulate; words fail him to express the grandeur of his Gospel, and then sometimes—not very often, but just sometimes—the heart of the poet wakens, and the words come, and a congregation receives an unusual and helpful sermon.

> My mind has thunderstorms,
> That brood for heavy hours,
> Until they rain me words.
> My thoughts are drooping flowers,
> And sulking, silent birds.
> Yet come, dark thunderstorms,
> And brood your heavy hours;
> For when you rain me words,
> My thoughts are dancing flowers,
> And joyful singing birds.[1]

It is a privilege to be a true poet. It is a privilege above all things to be a preacher of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. But if one could only be both! Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, said Moses of old. Would God that all the Lord's prophets were poets also.

LANCELOT J. VINALL.

1 W. H. Davies.

MODERNISM AND ESCHATOLOGY.

The tendency among Modernists is to reject thoroughgoing eschatology as an essential constituent of Christology because in their opinion it is one-sided and does justice neither to the Synoptic evidence for the life of Jesus nor to a common-sense view of His person and work. Left-wing Modernists, who are usually ready to believe anything, are rare among English theologians, who on the whole endeavour to remain half-way between the Liberal-Protestant and the Eschatological Jesus. Prof. Kirsopp Lake appears to be the only one (among those who count) who is prepared to go the whole way along the road opened out by the eschatological school; but Prof. Lake (with his colleague Prof. Foakes Jackson) is looked upon with disfavour by the whole body of Anglican Modernists. Prof. Burkitt, too, years ago, was regarded as an adherent of the eschatological "school." Among Catholics, George Tyrrell, who was a fluent writer but haphazard and without value as a thinker, supported the new conception of Jesus as a prophet whose outlook and teaching were completely conditioned by the apocalyptic-eschatological type of thought. Tyrrell's position has often been exaggerated by those who have written about it. If Karl Holl's characterization of him as the "Höhepunkt des Modernismus," [1] and Söderblom's statement that after Loisy's works those of Tyrrell's have been more widely read than those of any other Modernist,[2] are true, it is not because of any profundity of thought. Tyrrell was a facile thinker, but his critical training was slight. He accepted the eschatological presentation of Jesus without paying much attention to the critical evidence against it. With Sanday, however, he was one of the earliest interpreters of eschatology to English theology: whatever importance he may have consists in that. For the purpose of this article, then, Kirsopp Lake may be excluded as not being representative of the views of the typical English Modernist, and Tyrrell can be discounted because of the inadequacy of his critical equipment and also because he belonged to the Modernist movement in the Roman Church.

Modern Christology began with an increasing emphasis on the need for a more historical approach to the interpretation of the person of Jesus. The traditional, supra-historical Christ was not enough; so the Germans produced a picture of Jesus which had no supernatural in its composition. It was the picture of a Jesus up-to-date, such as might meet the needs of the modern world, or rather of the Liberal-Protestants of the Lutheran Church. Whatever were the defects of

[1] *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte,* Band III, article on Modernismus, p. 451. Tübingen, 1928).

[2] *Religionsproblemet inom Katolicism och Protestantism, Vol. I: Modernismet* (Stockholm, 1910) p. 162.

this new portrait, it was at any rate better than the traditionalist caricature. Just as the 19th century Jesus was a reaction against the 5th century impossibility which resulted from the Council of Chalcedon, so the newer Jesus, the Jesus of Wrede and Johannes Weiss and Schweitzer, was a reaction against the preceding tendency. The eschatologists wanted a Jesus who was part and parcel of His own time; it was their purpose to discover, as far as they could, the Jesus of the first century. In a word, they represented an attempt, an extreme attempt, to give Jesus His true historical setting by showing how far He shared the intellectual conditions of His time. And like most pioneers, they refused compromise. Schweitzer, of course, was the literary genius of the new Christology; he was also its consummation and its most vigorous protagonist. It is because of the severity of their onslaught on the Liberal idea of Jesus and because they were so uncompromising that the eschatologists met with so little support in England. Yet their contentions obliged English theologians to take cognizance of the new emphasis, and compelled them to examine how far they were justifiable. The result is that to-day the eschatological element in the Gospels and its influence on the teaching of Jesus cannot be ignored: it must be realized that in some degree it is organically connected with Jesus' intellectual life. All that can be said is that English Modernists differ, not as to the general principle of the eschatologists, but as to the possibility of applying it as rigorously and as ruthlessly as they do. Prof. Kirsopp Lake and George Tyrrell, I have said, have endorsed the findings of the eschatologists. In the following pages I shall give an account of the views of the leading Anglican Modernists on the eschatological interpretation, and show that the thoroughgoing acceptance of the position is universally rejected.

Sanday, the most liberal-minded and sympathetic of the end-of-the century theologians, who during the last fifteen years or so of his life definitely associated himself with the Modernist movement in the Church of England, was, I believe, the first to appreciate the eschatological point of view in any considerable degree. Besides being one of the acutest New Testament scholars of his time, he represented a projection of the older generation into the present century, and showed himself in sympathy with the tendencies in Continental thought which were in progress during the first ten years or so. His chapters in his *Life of Christ in Recent Research* dealing with the matter under review show that he was alive to the importance of the eschatological approach and of its acceptance by distinguished Continental scholars. Yet he did not accept all the conclusions put forward by that school. It has been alleged [1] that he at first welcomed Schweitzer's eschatology with enthusiasm, but apologetically

1 Introduction to Schweitzer's *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God*, p. 20.

renounced his wholehearted acceptance of it after reading Von Dobschütz's lectures on the Eschatology of the Gospels. This is an overstatement, for Sanday's attitude towards eschatology was throughout moderate and critical, as his treatment of the subject in his earlier work demonstrates. He agrees with Schweitzer in his criticism of the modern desire to explain away [1] certain critical difficulties, such as the problem of the " ransom " verse; he agrees, too,[2] that much of the parabolic teaching is eschatological. Yet he is unable to assent to the contention that it was unnecessary for Jesus to recast the popular Jewish apocalyptic idea. In conclusion, he says: " I believe it to be, on the whole, as great a mistake to try to explain everything in the life of our Lord in terms of eschatology as it is to treat the eschatology as a mere appendage." In an article written later [3] his position is not substantially altered. His conclusions are the same, though he arrives at them not so much by accepting a general principle which appears plausible as by examining eschatology in the light of Synoptic criticism. Five years' work, he says, are marked, " on the one hand by the strong affirmation of the reality and importance of the apocalyptic element in the Gospels—not exactly as *the* starting point, but as the one main starting point for the teaching of our Lord, and for His own conception of His mission."

This seems to be not a retreat from the position of Schweitzer, but rather an endorsement of it. Yet if one tendency has been to establish the authenticity of the eschatological element, another has been to insist that this element, genuine though it may be to a certain extent, gathered additional matter as time went on. " Q " is vague and reticent; there is little eschatological material in *Mark*. In *Luke* it has increased. Streeter and Von Dobschütz contend that even *Mark* heightens the apocalyptic imagery. " Q," further, offers no date of the second coming. Eschatological uncertainty is greatest in the so-called Little Apocalypse of *Mark* 13. This is a passage of critical importance. A comparison of the Messiah of the Synoptist with that of the *Psalms of Solomon* shows that whereas the Suffering Servant is the type of the former, the latter is a Warrior King, there being no quality common to these two. Jesus' conception, it would appear, has little relation to that of contemporary apocalyptic. In his criticism of Schweitzer Sanday says: " The fundamental mistake of Schweitzer's theory lies just in what he believes to be its special value, the vigorous application of logic. . . . Only by a good deal of forcing can the ethics of Jesus be described as an *Interimsethik*." [4] He concludes that it is impossible to distinguish between what can be authentically attributed to Jesus and what is due to Christian tradition.

[1] *Life of Christ in Recent Research*, p. 96. [2] *Ibid.*
[3] *Hibbert Journal*, Vol. X (1910), p. 83. [4] *Ibid*, p. 103.

In any case, as in *Mark* 13[13] and *Matthew* 24[36], there is evidence that the approaching end of the world was not imminent.

Sanday's view, generally speaking, is that which is held by the avowed exponents of English Modernism. Thus Canon Streeter writes: "Men are urged not to be anxious for the morrow, not for the eschatological reason that to-morrow they may awake in another world, but because God's providence is daily shown in His feeding the fowls of the air and clothing the lilies of the field." [1] The cataclysmic, lurid, demonic conflicts of popular eschatology are almost if not entirely absent from the teaching of Jesus. "What the Day of the Lord is to the old prophets, that the coming of the kingdom is to our Lord—an essential part of His message, but not its main content." There are, clearly, two kinds of teaching about the kingdom—the one regarding it as catastrophic and the other as gradual, as illustrated by the parables of growth.[2] Streeter supports Sanday's conclusion with words very similar in content: "The eschatalogical teaching is a simpler, wider, and greater thing than ordinary Jewish apocalyptic, but for myself I am coming more and more to feel that to water down and explain away the apocalyptic element is to miss something which is essential. Much of the unique moral grasp of the New Testament is in one way directly a result of the eschatological background of the period." [3] Dr. Percy Gardner would go further in his rejection of eschatology as an essential part of Christ's outlook: "What is clear is that the belief in a cataclysm is not primary, does not completely condition the whole teaching of Jesus, but is a separate or extraneous element, which is not dominant." [4]

Dr. Rashdall's estimate of the relation of Christ's ethics to His eschatology may be taken as representing the point of view most acceptable to those who find themselves obliged, for critical reasons, to reject thoroughgoing eschatology. In *Conscience and Christ* he maintains that the fundamental fault of Schweitzer's eschatology is its complete subordination of the ethics, which have universal and permanent value, to the eschatology, which was neither applicable universally nor justified by the progress of events. The security of the critical basis of the eschatological predictions is doubtful in the first place because "not one of them belongs to what is perhaps the best attested stratum of Synoptic tradition." [5] Not one of them belongs to "Q." In the second place, they are inconsistent with one another. The discourse of *Mark* 13 "may contain genuine sayings of Christ, but it cannot be treated as conclusive evidence as to the way in which Christ Himself spoke of His 'coming'!" [6] All the passages which profess to fix the date of the final judgment Rashdall regards as of doubtful authenticity. It may be accepted

1 *Foundations*, p. 109. See pp. 107-110 for the whole discussion. 2 *Ibid.*, p. 113.
3 *Ibid.*, p. 119. 4 *The Practical Basis of Christian Belief*, p. 160. 5 p. 44. 6 p. 47.

as certain[1] that the earliest theme of Christ's teaching was that the Kingdom of God was at hand, though what was meant by "at hand" cannot be ascertained. The textual evidence, in brief, for the authenticity of the eschatological sayings is extremely uncertain. But in addition to this, even if the eschatological passages could be established as being authentic, it is not true that they represent the Kingdom without exception as something to be introduced by a future catastrophic event.[2] If this is accepted, an examination of the "Kingdom passages" shows quite clearly that the content of the idea is not eschatological but primarily ethical. It is, as Von Dobschütz described it, "transmuted eschatology." "It implies not merely that the Kingdom is not wholly future, but that even the Kingdom that is future is at bottom—in its inmost essence—a moral and spiritual conception." [3] Possibly Jesus expected the establishment of a supernatural kingdom; but that is no reason for inferring that the chief constituent idea was this expectation. The essence of the idea of the kingdom was a condition of things in which the union of man and God was to be realized or made more possible. "According to the ultra-eschatological school, all the emphasis was upon the Eschatology. I believe the exact opposite would be the case. In the teaching of Jesus all the emphasis was on the Ethics, and upon Religion of an intensely ethical type." [4] Yet even if it were possible to accept Schweitzer's complete subordination of ethics to eschatology, that would not in the least invalidate the ethics. They must be judged as ethics, and not as ethics in relation to eschatology. The history of Christianity has shown the latter approach to be the true one; for it is the universality of the ethics which has transcended the peculiarly local-temporal nature of the eschatology. There is, then, "no *a priori* reason for treating the Ethics of Jesus as useless to modern society, because He entertained certain eschatological expectations." [5] If it be granted that, from the eschatological point of view, the ethical teaching was for Jesus subordinate to the eschatology, it does not follow that it must be secondary for us.[6] The question is really irrelevant. What is relevant is that the ethics, not the eschatology, occupy the position of primary importance.

This attitude explains more than the thoroughgoing eschatology, which implies that universality is the one quality which is lacking in the world's greatest spiritual genius, a quality which is essential to all other types of genius. The universality found in the great creators of imaginative experience Schweitzer would deny to the greatest source of man's spiritual life. Modernism, as expressed by Rashdall,

[1] p. 49. [2] p. 51. [3] p. 55.
[4] p. 59. [5] p. 62. [6] p. 66.

repudiates this rigorous limitation of Christ's thought by the conditions of His intellectual environment.[1]

The most elaborate criticism of the eschatological position has been made by C. W. Emmet and Miss Dougall. The purpose of their book, *The Lord of Thought,* is to show that the teaching of Jesus was not conditioned by the eschatological outlook, " that Jesus did not expect a speedy and supernatural destruction of the world, but that he did expect the termination of an order of society based on oppression." [2] They begin by examining the theology of Jewish apocalyptic. God is the Judge, who will reward the righteous and condemn the wicked ; the emphasis is chiefly on the divine vengeance, not on the divine love. Wherever there is any indication that God can show compassion on men, it is not on the sinners but on the righteous that it is bestowed. " It was the arbitrary infliction of punitive torture by God upon His enemies, in a supernatural world, which the Jewish religion of our period taught." [3] John the Baptist was a destructionist, not a forerunner of Jesus, and there is no evidence that he regarded Jesus as an agent of divine intervention.[4] The Apocalyptic Son of Man, as He is delineated in the *Book of Enoch,* is cruel and relentless—a ruthless judge. The character of Jesus contradicts this.[5] In the summary of the Synoptic account of the teaching of Jesus, it is pointed out that what inconsistency there is in this teaching depends on the inclusion of the apocalyptic element ; if this is eliminated the bulk of the teaching is quite consistent.[6] If the teaching is examined in the light of national crisis it is easy to perceive the reasonableness of the attitude of Jesus : it is expedient as well as intrinsically commendable. It is necessary, then, to regard the future as the effect of a natural historic process of causation, not exclusively as a demonstration of divine vengeance. The parable of the Virgins should not be accepted as symbolism or allegory, but merely as a story told to illustrate the idea of lost opportunity. It need not necessarily refer to the coming of the Son of Man nor to a visitation by the Father. The parables should be applied generally, not in detail. " The ' power that casts into hell,' into all the ' hells ' there are, is sin, *i.e.,* the law of consequence working through sin." [7] At the back of Jesus' teaching is not a lurid divine interference, but the law of causation working out its effects in history. If the teaching of Jesus concerning punishment is compared with that of apocalyptic, it is argued, nothing could be further

1 Rashdall in *The Idea of the Atonement,* which was written in lecture form earlier than *Conscience and Christ,* says : " His conception had much more affinity with the apocalyptic idea of a purely supernatural being, who should descend from heaven, bringing to an end the existing order of society " (p. 7). " To this future manifestation of Himself as Messiah He did, it is probable, apply more or less of the current apocalyptic language about the celestial glory and exaltation of the Messiah " (p. 8). " There was in our Lord's teaching very little eschatological detail " (p. 12). His views appear to be considerably modified in his later book.

2 p. v. 3 p. 45. 4 p. 85. 5 pp. 96 8. 6 p. 114. 7 p. 174.

removed from this than the idea of punishment as found in the *Apocalypse of Ezra* $8^{20, 23}$, *etc.*, which is claimed to be on a higher level than the usual apocalyptic literature dealing with the subject.[1]

What, then, is the critical verification of this point of view? Touching the Synoptic references to anger and punishment, it is held that the relevant parables are not to be interpreted allegorically in the first place, and, in the second, the language in *Matthew* has been considerably heightened: it is a Jewish Gospel, and into it have been introduced apocalyptic ideas more or less absent from the other two. The differences between them are due to polemic or to glosses.[2] The phrase "Kingdom of Heaven" nowhere occurs in literature earlier than the Gospels; hence Jesus was not using current apocalyptic ideas. The idea of the kingdom was not catastrophic—a conception entirely opposed to the spirit of Jesus, and absurd when reconsidered in the light of His general teaching. Nor is the kingdom a *deus ex machina,* but the result of divine and human co-operation, that is, in so far as the repentance of man makes its coming possible. It is determined by man's response to God's offer; hence it is "at hand" if man desires it. The "kingdom passages" "are understood in the eschatological sense only under pressure of the general hypothesis, based on other passages, that this feature is, in fact, authentic and central in the teaching of Jesus. But if the hypothesis is rejected, they at once become susceptible of another and an easier explanation." [3]

As to the term "Son of Man," the writers maintain that it was used in the sense in which it is found in *Ezekiel* and in *Ps.* 8, not in the Enochic sense, as it created no sensation, which it would have done had the latter been the case. It was used to represent man at his best or mankind as a whole.[4] It is not the idea of the Messianic Judge which is uppermost in the mind of Jesus. "If the thought of an immediate coming to judgment was central in the mind of Jesus we should expect that the climax of the predictions would have been the return in the clouds; instead of this it is always the Resurrection." [5]

Such are the main arguments against the eschatological position advanced by Dougall and Emmet.[6] How far they are critically tenable it is not the present purpose to enquire. It is the general

[1] pp. 182, 183. [2] p. 249. [3] p. 264. [4] pp. 277, ff. [5] p. 281.

[6] The same attitude is adopted by Emmet in a smaller and earlier work, *The Eschatological Question of the Gospels* (1911). The first half of the book is a refutation of Schweitzer's picture of Jesus, which is thus criticized: "We see one whose whole life was based on a fundamental error, whose every action and word were dictated by His all-absorbing belief in the nearness of the end, whose knowledge and will were thwarted by predestinarianism" (p. 71). "The picture which Schweitzer has drawn is not one sided; it is a caricature" (p. 72). And further: "It is one thing to admit that He did to some extent share the beliefs of His time, while rising far above them in all that is of the essence of religion. It is quite another to find the all-absorbing interest, and the motive power of His life, in a single peculiar, and not very spiritual, class of Jewish ideas" (p. 73).

attitude which is significant, for it represents the thought of Modernists as a whole in relation to the problem. A judicious criticism of the Synoptic evidence destroys or at least weakens the case of the thoroughgoing eschatologist; a fair evaluation of the significance of the ethical teaching reverses its relation to eschatology according to the conception held by Schweitzer. English Modernism will not allow the prophet-Jesus to usurp the place of the teacher-Jesus, though there is room for both in a humanistic, historical Christology.

Canon Streeter arrived earlier at conclusions similar to the above in his textual analysis of the eschatological materials in the Gospels. The evidence is on the whole against the authenticity of much of the eschatological utterance: "The apocalyptic element in *Mark* has a precision and detail not found in "Q"; in *Matthew* is seen a still further development. The eschatological language of the Master becomes more and more conformed to the apocalyptic picture which was cherished by the early church." [1] "Sayings which are catastrophic appear to imply a catastrophic coming of the kingdom which is in some sense already present, and which will increase by a gradual growth." [2] In *Mark* there is very little eschatological matter attributable to Jesus. It is possible that the process of addition may be as old as "Q," which may represent an advance on earlier sources. Yet it is impossible completely to eliminate the eschatological sayings.[3]

The attitude of the English Modernists to eschatology may now be briefly summarized. While they recognize that in the Gospels in their present form there is much eschatological matter, a large part of it probably did not belong to the earliest strata of Christian writings. A process of progressive addition may be seen to have taken place from the earliest times; and the recognition of this makes it exceedingly difficult to separate definitely the authentic from the unauthentic. Certain passages, such as the Little Apocalypse, can, however, be reasonably demonstrated to be apocryphal. It is therefore dangerous to accept the contentions of the thoroughgoing eschatologist and to subordinate ethics to eschatology. The result is unnatural, and does scant justice to the portrait of the historic Jesus, because it is unacceptable as an explanation of the uniqueness and the universality of this creative personality.

If we are under any obligation to choose between the Christ of the Creeds and the Jesus of Eschatology, we can least afford to reject the latter; for with all His limitations, this Jesus is at least human and comprehensible. The Christ Who is the Second Person in the Trinity (I mean, of course, the Trinity of orthodoxy, classically conceived and expounded by Augustine in his *De Trinitate*) can have

1 *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, p. 425.
2 *Ibid.*, p. 427. 3 *Ibid.*, pp. 428, 179, ff.

no place in what Kirsopp Lake calls " the Religion of To-morrow " (perhaps a better phase would be the title of M. Guyau's book, *The Non-Religion of the Future*); nor can the Christ of the Kenotists make much appeal to the unmetaphysical. It is, at least, possible to accept the Eschatological Christ; but not as the ultimate statement of Christology. That is where Schweitzer fails: he would have the Eschatological Jesus as the consummation of Christologizing, rather than a stage or constituent in the evolution of a Christology. At first sight a teacher whose activities were so conditioned by his Jewish environment could not be a world-teacher; yet that is only partly true. For the ethics of Jesus and His teaching about God can be of universal value apart from their apocalyptic-eschatological setting. Whether His ethic was an *interimsethik* for Him is of no account: it need not be, and is not, an *interimsethik* for us and for the world of the future. There are replies, naturally, to the critics who find silence a negative proof. There is, it has been said, no evidence of eschatological matter in " Q "; but there are no parables in " Q." And no one with any literary or critical sense would reject *Luke* 15 because there is no parallel to it elsewhere. Yet it would be justifiable, analogically, if anyone were to do so. Whether we reject thoroughgoing eschatology is, I believe, ultimately, not so much a matter of minute criticism; it depends largely upon our own Christological preconceptions. I do not care very much whether the teaching of Jesus was conditioned by such a world-outlook as the eschatologists claim for Him; I do not care whether He regarded Himself as a Messiah (for that means nothing to the twentieth century) nor whether He was mistaken in His claims. He was mistaken in almost all the claims He made; the claims which Christians have made for Him since were not even suggested by Him. He claimed, it can scarcely be doubted, to be the Messiah; the Messiah with an apocalyptic enthronement, possibly; we know that His claim was mistaken. The Christian Church believes that He is the Incarnation of God; though no one has yet been quite clear as to what Incarnation really means. But Jesus never spoke about the Incarnation. No Jew would. So one might go on enumerating things; we see what we want to see, and our Christology depends on what we see and how we see it. For some the eschatological Jesus may be—for Schweitzer, for example—the power of God unto salvation. Yet others may not be able to find inspiration in this picture. It is largely a matter of emotional and not intellectual activity. *Gefühl ist Alles*! says Faust to Mephistopheles. It may not be all; but it is a great deal; and the religious life consists rather of feelings than of logical processes of the intellect. Theorising about Jesus is easy, and feeling is often responsible for misunderstanding. We may conclude what we will, but something which is spiritually discernible eludes the intellect. We feel that He is greater than we know.

G. V. Jones.

BETTER FOLLOWS WORSE.

Does better follow worse? Many would hesitate to say yes. Some would vehemently deny it. Thomas Hardy found it difficult to see better anywhere. Dean Inge tirelessly reminds us that moral and spiritual progress is not inevitable. When the question for debate is, "Has the material enrichment of the race made us happier than our predecessors?" the result of the vote is uncertain. The purpose of this paper is to maintain that the race is making a genuine moral and spiritual progress. The writer is not blind to the darker and more painful facts of life. He is making no suggestion that we have already attained. Far from it. His only contention is that we are moving, and moving upward. When one chews the leaf of the gymnenia sylvestre plant it so affects the palate that sugar will taste like sand, and sulphate of quinine like chalk. There is a weakness for chewing this mischievous leaf to-day. It is making life's sweets taste like sand to us. When the storm was raging on the Galilean lake, and the fisherman saw the form of a man walking its turbulent waters, they feared it was some presageful ghost. Yet the visitor was their divinest friend; and the storm enriched them with a precious revelation of His care for them and His power to save them. I have looked out on life a long time now, and my experience has wrought in me the conviction that the end of the wilderness wanderings is a promised land for the race.

Out of what has this conviction grown? Partly because I have learned from the Christian Scriptures that a good and loving God is on the throne of the universe, and that He is graciously leading humanity through all its blunders to a fuller, richer, and nobler life: and, partly, because I find this faith confirmed by long years of observation and wide experience of the world. It is the chaff that is burned: the wheat is garnered. It is the lie that dies, the truth that multiplies. The vultures scavenge the offensive carcases. That does not mean that every change is an improvement. When a farmer says he has done better this year than last, that does not mean that every crop has been bigger and more profitable than every crop was last year: it only means that, putting the better and the worse together, the average result has been more satisfactory. It is often said that the late war was a relapse into barbarism. It emphatically was. It is impossible to think of its awful devilry without a shudder. And its mischiefs still live on in the lives of many to whom it brought moral ruin, and its tragedies will be carried to the grave by many a bereaved heart. But—

When things look black at night,
Turn on the electric light,

and then we see that by our worst blunders, as well as by our sincerest sagacities, God teaches us. The war has sobered us: it has affronted our moral sense. The cry—"this must never happen again"—is insistent. It has brought the peoples of the Western Continent, especially the United States, into the family of nations, not only for the discouragement of war, but also for the co-operation of the whole race in many humanitarian efforts. Winter has a stern and hard face, but winter is a good friend.

I am equally convinced that our theological and religious upheavals will ultimately produce a more rational and secure faith, and a healthier and robuster spiritual life. We no longer have to justify the Jews' slaughter of rival nations—men, women, children, and cattle—because some religious fanatic said, "Thus saith the Lord." We are no longer called upon to defend Jonah's interview with the whale, nor the Hebrew children's stroll in Nebuchadnezzar's furnace. We no longer affront the finer moral instincts in man by the assertions that the Lord Jesus had to endure the agonies of the Cross to move the Father to pity and love for His wayward children, and that endless, fiery torments would be the lot of the prodigal. It has become plain that the essence of the Christian revelation is that God is love: and the essence of the Christian life is that we have in us that spirit of Christ that loves God with all the heart and one's neighbour as oneself. The Church is for the moment sowing these truths in tears, but the summer is coming when a great harvest will be reaped from them. Tennyson hit a bull's-eye when he sang:—

> Oh yet we trust that somehow good
> Will be the final goal of ill,
> To pangs of nature, sins of will,
> Defects of doubt, and taints of blood:
>
> That nothing walks with aimless feet;
> That not one life shall be destroy'd,
> Or cast as rubbish to the void,
> When God hath made the pile complete:
>
> That not a worm is cloven in vain;
> That not a moth with vain desire
> Is shrivell'd in a fruitless fire,
> Or but subserves another's gain.

I see an immense improvement, too, in the lot of the young, and of the poorer classes. If there is to-day a revolution in the relationship of parents and children it is, in the main, a beneficent change. No school child now would stay in a Dotheboys Hall. No parent now treats his children as our grand-parents often treated theirs. Rowland Hill never dared address his father without calling him "Sir," nor might he leave a room without bowing to his father's arm-chair, even when the chair was empty. Fanny Burney was nearly 50 when her mother died, yet she had never once sat in her presence unless expressly bidden to do so. The great Lord Shaftesbury's

father, whenever his sons did anything of which he disapproved, even after they were young men, would clench his fist and knock them down. Lady Oxford once saw her brother Edward's tutor roughly strike him, and had her own ears boxed for remonstrating. Children to-day are treated with justice and respect. Parents now are the chums of their sons and daughters: autocracy has been replaced by reason and love, to the mutual profit of old and young.

A similar beneficent change has taken place in the treatment of the poor. Poor Law Institutions have vastly improved during the last fifty years. The buildings are sanitary and comfortably warmed: they are adequately staffed with well-equipped officials: the food is good and sufficient: and gramophones, wireless, and concerts brighten the lives of the inmates. Some years ago a fellow-guardian told me that, in the early days of his Guardianship, the only nurses in the Institution were several old pauper women, and one of these was suffering with a cancerous face: a contrast indeed to the trained, alert, and courteous nurses that now minister to our dependent sick. Add to this that pensions are now provided for many widows and their children, and for the aged, and it is obvious that an immense stride forward has been taken.

There is a similar improvement in the lot of the wage-earner. In fifty years his wage has trebled, whilst the cost of living has only about doubled; and his working hours have been reduced from 60 to 48, or less. His whole environment has improved immensely. Fustians and corduroys have given place to broadcloth, the scarf to collar and tie, clogs to boots; and his wife's shawl to a picturesque hat and silk stockings. He is now beginning to live in a sanitary house, often with a bath; a carpet has taken the place of sand on the floor; the candle is replaced by the electric light; and the concertina and mouth-organ by the gramophone and wireless. If unemployed, he has insurance pay: if injured, compensation: his Trade Union protects him from victimization: and in his old age there is a pension for himself and for his wife. Alexander Hamilton once wrote, "The essence of statesmanship is to see that burdens should be distributed, and benefits shared." It is no exaggeration to say that we are making rapid strides towards the realization of this ideal.

Then there is a marked improvement in the social habits of our people. The silly habit of swearing still persists, but with decreasing vitality. Cock-fights, dog-fights, pigeon shooting, and stag-hunting are still indulged in, but they are rapidly becoming regarded as cruel and discreditable. The Village Hall, with its library, billiards, music, and dancing, has almost displaced the village beer-house as the centre of the poor man's social life. There is, moreover, a distinct diminution of the Anglo-Saxon vice of drunkenness. In a quarter of a century the consumption of spirits has fallen from about 32 million gallons to something under 4½ million gallons, and beer

is following suit. Cinema and wireless are splendid auxiliaries of temperance. The mechanically-driven vehicle is abetting the same good cause. The sober horse generally contrived to get its drunken driver safely home: but the fuddled driver of motor-car or bike soon finds himself in a police-station or hospital; and the knowledge of the penalty contributes to sobriety. The business man is replacing his morning glass of wine by a cup of coffee, both for himself and his clients. Hospitals are rapidly diminishing their use of alcohol; and its deleterious effect upon the body is being widely taught in our elementary schools. One does not forget the regrettable growth of clubs where drink is provided, nor that we still spend nearly a million a day on alcoholic beverages; yet, when these facts on the other side are frankly acknowledged, it is still obvious that our social habits are improving, and that we are a growingly sober nation.

I see also a growing friendliness and co-operation among men. When Boswell asked Johnson, "Do you think, sir, that man is naturally good?", the sage answered, "No more, sir, than a wolf." Johnson loved terseness of speech, and this love of terseness probably made his unqualified verdict on his fellows more bitter than he meant. But the verdict is a false one, for, whatever man may have been in the earlier stages of his career, and may occasionally still be under the excitement of strong passions, he is rapidly subduing the wolf and the tiger in him. Charlotte Brontë tells us that when she was a girl at Haworth, it was a common saying in the neighbourhood: "Keep a stone in your pocket for seven years: then turn it, and keep it for seven years more, that it may be ready to your hand when you meet your enemy." Mrs. Gaskell tells us that she once saw a hideous-looking cottage which bore the suggestive name of "Spite Hall." She learned that it had been built, not to live in, but to interrupt the fine view of another house in which lived a disliked neighbour. The feeling that prompted the cherishing of this vindictive saying and dastardly act may still be cherished by a few, but, whenever expressed it would be met with frowns; it is the expression of brotherly sentiments that wins the approbation and the cheer. Talented and educated young people plant Settlements in squalid neighbourhoods, and give, not only their best, but their very selves, to their less fortunate brothers and sisters. Brotherhoods, Sisterhoods, Women's Institutes, and Rotaries are all the fruit of this growing friendly spirit. All well-wishers of their country are trying hard to replace the suspicion and antagonism between employers and employees by the spirit of trust and co-operation.

> There are nettles everywhere,
> But smooth, green grasses are more common still:
> The blue of heaven is larger than the cloud.

I see also a steady growth, not merely of tolerance, but also of genuine goodwill among the Churches. Readers of Boswell are

familiar with the story told by Lord Chancellor Eldon. He and Dr. Johnson were walking, together with their host, in the garden of Sir Robert Chalmers, at Oxford. Chalmers picked up several snails, and threw them over the wall into his neighbour's garden. Johnson was scandalized at the unneighbourly action, and protested against such conduct. "Sir," said Chalmers, "my neighbour is a Dissenter." "Oh," said Johnson, "if that is so, toss away, toss away, sir, as hard as you can." Fifty years ago this was a fairly common attitude towards the Free Churchman. It was a familiar joke that the Dissenter must have no blankets or coals here, and he would need none in the next world. This intolerance naturally produced resentments, and sometimes retaliation. One of my own predecessors in the ministry was the Rev. W. Thorne, a generous benefactor to Congregationalism, but such a vehement antagonist of Anglicanism that he won for our church the title of "Prickle Cathedral." Much of this evil spirit has passed, and more is passing. Men are concerned much less about the denomination or creed of a Church than they were. Brethren in Christ are being recognized and welcomed in all Churches. Lord Avebury tells of a medieval brigand who described himself as "a lover of God, and the enemy of mankind." Such a statement belongs to a dead past. Christ has joined together the love of God and the love of our brethren, and what God has joined none may divorce. Churches in England, Scotland, Canada, Australia, and India are uniting: and where corporate union is not at present possible, there is a rapidly growing desire for fellowship and brotherly co-operation. Judah is ceasing to vex Ephraim, and Ephraim to vex Judah.

One may hesitate to assert that there has been an improvement in the personal religion of our people during the last fifty years, yet, in some respects, there is distinct gain. The believer may not be quite so sure of his faith to-day, but neither is the unbeliever so sure of his doubts. Both are listening for the voice from heaven. The old complacency has given place to a humility and reverence that carry in them the germs of a great spiritual advance. Fifty years ago congregations thought as much of the penalties of hell as of the love of God. Christ was as much the Awful Judge as the Good Shepherd. Saintly souls were in constant dread that they had committed some unpardonable sin, and, in spite of daily watchings and mortifications, might yet be castaways. Fear, of course, has its uses, but it is no substitute for love, for fear is only destructive, while love alone can create. Love has replaced fear as the dominating motive in our Christianity to-day. We preach religion as a radiant experience, and an unclouded hope.

Further: in our estimate of our fellows we are putting the emphasis on the spirit, not the opinion; on the life, not the theology. In China the women used to bind the feet so tightly that the adult's

foot was little bigger than the child's. We are no longer cribbed and cabined by the creeds of childhood. We see to-day that a man will not be justified or condemned by his speculations, but by his motives and deeds. There are men who hesitate to sign many articles in the creeds, yet their lives are so full of reverence and love and service that we grasp their hands at once as brothers in Christ and authentic sons of God. We see now that the strait gate is the Spirit, and the narrow way is the life that leads to the land of the leal.

And then we are certainly grasping the implications of the social aspects of the Christian Gospel as they have not been grasped since the days of the Apostles. We are laying hold of the fact that if God is our Father, then all men—not only the saints—are our brethren. Dives may have been an orthodox member of the synagogue, but he was no son of Abraham. The " Good Samaritan " may have been a faulty theologian, but he had in him the spirit that won approval from God's Son. Mr. John Burns has appropriated from Tom Paine the motto, " The world is my country, and to do good is my religion." We raise our hats to-day to men who live up to such an ideal: and we give thanks to God for un-aureoled saints like Cadbury, Grenfell, Schweitzer, and others who consecrate themselves, and all they possess, to teaching the ignorant, healing the sick, comforting the sorrowful, and bringing hope to the dying, in the very spirit of Him Who loved men, and gave Himself for them.

In writing this paper I have done my best not to fall into a well while looking at the stars. I have never forgotten, whilst writing it, that we are not living in a social, economic, or religious arcady at present. It will probably be a long time before the barometer stands at set fair. Yet I am profoundly convinced that our world is not plunging wildly forward like a motor-car that has lost its driver, but that it is moving from a planned past to an anticipated future: that it is not an iceberg aimlessly drifting: it is a ship with an infallible Captain on the bridge: and He is steadily steering it to its destined port. It is inconceivable to me that God should be finally defeated in His purposes of good. Life is full of apparent ironies, but the man who sees nothing but ironies in life is himself the greatest irony of all. Nor can I conceive of man's short stay on this planet exhausting all the moral and spiritual possibilities in him. When we arrived in this world adequate preparations had been made to welcome us, and to surround us with loving care and help. I am convinced that a similar welcome, and a yet greater love, await the good in the next world when death is swallowed up in life. If the Christian Gospel means anything, it means that

> . . . the scaffold sways the future,
> And behind the dim unknown
> Standeth God within the shadow,
> Keeping watch above His own.

As that dear old character, Mrs. Bean, says, " Expect everything, and some of it happens." And we are justified in expecting that in God's world " Better follows worse."

Life hath its counterparts, and I believe
There gleams a certain goal for every quest,
That truth at last shall every doubt relieve,
And all earth's weariness find perfect rest.
That for each fall shall come a step above,
A joy for every stroke of sorrow's rod,
For every blighting hate a healing love,
For all the hunger of my soul—a God.

G. Frank Cullen.

HISTORY, POLITICS AND RELIGION IN CERTAIN POEMS[1] OF WILLIAM COWPER.

WHAT progress in knowledge and in ignorance have we made since 1874? It was not patently absurd then, as it would be now, to assert of William Cowper: "There are few, if any, of our poets whose lives or writings are better known." Cowper's poems were, we may believe, for poems, well known in 1874. To-day they are not; and as for his life, about that only so much is known, or invented, as may be useful to belabour the name of the Rev. John Newton. Most people believe Cowper to have been a weak, pleasant, sentimental man driven to melancholy and almost to suicide by an evangelical clergyman, the worst of a bad type; and they are more interested in the moral of their fable *Ecrasez l'infâme* than in its accuracy or even its verisimilitude.

The object of this paper is not to whitewash John Newton. Of John Newton it has indeed long been clear to every prejudiced mind that no good can be said. He was guilty not only of an active share in the negro slave trade, but also of the execrable taste of an evangelical conversion. For this indulgence in the worst of both worlds it is but seemly that he should reap his reward; every psychologist knows that the one thing more deplorable than vice is the abandonment of it under the influence of religion. Besides, has not John Foster many years ago written an essay *On Some of the Causes by which Evangelical Religion has been rendered less acceptable to Persons of Cultivated Taste*. There is no need to write that essay afresh.

Nor is the object of the paper to urge a universal reading of Cowper. Cowper is of all English writers the one most difficult for this generation to appreciate. His defects leap from the page. Even in 1782 the *Critical Review* said of one batch of the poems to be considered that it was "little better than a dull sermon," displaying that mediocrity which neither gods nor men can tolerate. That judgment contains truth. He who would enjoy Cowper must be prepared for endless moralization and edification pitched in a surprisingly low key. If you cannot willingly suffer couplets like these:—

> There is a prurience in the speech of some,
> Wrath stays Him, or else God would strike them dumb;
> His wise forbearance has their end in view,
> They fill their measure and receive their due.
>
> Oh come not ye near innocence and truth,
> Ye worms that eat into the bud of youth.
> Infectious as impure, your blighting power
> Taints in its rudiments the promised flower.

[1] Table Talk, The Progress of Error, The Task, Truth, Expostulation, Hope, Tirocinium, Charity, Conversation, Retirement.

'Tis not alone the grape's enticing juice
Unnerves the moral powers and mars their use;
Ambition, avarice, and the lust of fame,
And woman, lovely woman, does the same;

if you do not relish poems whose "arguments" run "The rural thief; public houses; the multitude of them censured; the farmer's daughter; what she was; what she is; reflection on bodies corporate; apostrophe to popular applause; retailers of ancient philosophy expostulated with; effects of sacerdotal mismanagement on the laity"; if you have no stomach for this fight, Cowper is no good to you, nor you to Cowper.

To appreciate Cowper it is needful to have not only that intimate inside knowledge of English evangelical piety which people like Samuel Butler, Edmund Gosse, and Gerald Bullett (to make a mixed posy) have had; it is needful, too, to have a certain decent loyalty to it which they all lacked in the most eminent degree. Without these qualities a man will be silly enough to despise Cowper or priggish enough to patronize him. That is why, unless people have a very unusual approach to the poet, it is dangerous for their souls' health to urge them to read him.

But if, gentle reader, you will grant, for the purpose of this paper only, that Cowper might be sincerely fond of the Rev. John Newton and at the same time be in possession of his senses; that he might truly find in his evangelical faith the pleasure and the comfort that he says he found and yet have the touch in letters more like Horace's than any other in English; that, mooning about in his gardens in the flats of the midlands, "sodden and unkind" as they are, taming hares, reading aloud at nights, watching the changing seasons, he got more genuine satisfaction out of life than three-quarters of the pert rascals who have deluged him with sceptical suburban pity, we can proceed, for you will understand that Cowper meant what he said to his contemporary (and later) critics:—

Retort the charge, and let the world be told
She boasts a confidence she does not hold.

That while in health the ground of her support
Is madly to forget that life is short;
That sick she trembles, knowing she must die,
Her hope presumption and her faith a lie.
Tell her again, the sneer upon her face
And all her censures on the work of grace
Are insincere, meant only to conceal
A dread she would not, yet is forced to feel;
That in her heart the Christian she reveres
And while she seems to scorn him only fears.

Of Cowper's life it is necessary that we remember the following things. He was born in 1731 and died in 1800. He had two points at least in common with many other great men: he provided the best

possible argument against clerical celibacy (being the son of a rector) and he was educated at Westminster School. At 19 apprenticed to an attorney, at 23 called to the Bar, he made no serious effort to maintain himself. He came of a well-to-do family and had already developed his dreamy literary tastes. The influence of a relative procured for him, when he was 32, nomination to the office of Clerk of the Journals of the House of Lords, but the prospect of a public examination to test his fitness for the work drove him to his first mental collapse and attempted suicide; all this, we observe, before the appearance of the Rev. Mr. Newton or even his own conversion.

Two things now happened: first, Cowper came to that evangelical faith which he at least believed to be the best happiness in his life; and, second, his family, assured (as they might well be) that making money was not to be his career, agreed to provide him with a competence. From this point, when Cowper was in the middle thirties, to his death at the age of 69, his life is of one piece, broken by interludes of depression and occasional insanity; but the importance of these interludes has been vastly over-rated. Most of the time Cowper lived happily and quietly in Huntingdonshire, or Northamptonshire, loving the countryside as only the genuine countryman can, and much concerned in what he calls "female society." From the time when at twenty he began in London "eyeing the women" and "making free comment on their shapes" to his final breakdown in sorrow for the death of Mrs. Unwin—he was 65—Cowper owed much to a succession of pious, sprightly, fashionable women who crossed his path. And behind it all, the women and the countryside, is that pure faith that puts him with children into the simplicity of the Kingdom of God.

He wrote and published a little when he was in town, helping his brother to translate Voltaire's *Henriade*. John Newton set him again on this way by inducing him to write 67 of the *Olney Hymns*. These he wrote when he was about 40. Not until he was almost 50 did he begin the first of those longer poems that are to occupy us. The first group—called "little better than a dull sermon"—came out in 1782: the greatest poem, *The Task*, three years later. At once, by this and *John Gilpin*, published a little before, Cowper's fame was made. His other poems, including his *Homer*, did but add to his reputation as the greatest poet of his generation. His relatives and friends (among them his old school-fellow, Lord Chancellor Thurlow) revived their flagging or dormant affection; and there we leave him happy in merited fame, shadowed only by his old disorder and mortality itself.

So much it was needful to recount in order to portray the man whose political views we are to examine as they lie before us in his poems.

And if this was the man, what of his country, the country of his great apostrophe:—

> England, with all thy faults, I love thee still,
> My country!

England he had seen dominating the world under the great Whig ministries: he saw her now sunk under the alternative Tory policies of Little Englandism and imperial bluster to lose the best part of the new world, helpless amid the jeers of those she had lately beaten to a frazzle. The elder Pitt was gone. The younger had not come. It was a day of small things and puny men. From our far-flung provinces came not victories, but scandals: the muffled cry of the slave from the west, from the east the shriller complaint of the Begums of Oude. With bitter memories of the glory cut short by the peace-mongers of 1763, no one yet dreamed of that resurrection of British arms and British achievement soon to be provoked by revolutionary France.

> Poor England! Thou art a devoted deer,
> Beset with every ill but that of fear.
> The nations hunt, all mark thee for a prey;
> They swarm around thee and thou stand'st at bay,
> Undaunted still, though wearied and perplex'd,
> Once Chatham saved thee, but who saves thee next?

First of all, then, the poems reveal a Whig, the typical Whig of the upper middle class. The glances at political science and history betray him. Cowper discusses the origin of monarchy, and finds it easily in war. Covetousness, armed by Tubal, "the Vulcan of old times," discovered war.

> Savage at first
> The onset, and irregular; at length
> One eminent above the rest for strength,
> For stratagem, or courage, or for all
> Was chosen leader; him they served in war;
> And him in peace, for sake of warlike deeds,
> Reverenced no less.

He becomes king. Cowper mocks the devotees of monarchy and non-resistance, and states the Whig doctrine of respect for the man for the sake of the office, the doctrine set forth in the second Collect for the King in the Prayer Book Order of Holy Communion.

> We love
> The king who loves the law, respects his bounds,
> And reigns content with them; him we serve
> Freely and with delight, who leaves us free;
> But recollecting still that he is man
> We trust him not too far. King though he be,
> And king in England too, he may be weak,
> And vain enough to be ambitious still;
> May exercise amiss his proper powers
> Or covet more than freemen choose to grant.

Beyond that mark is treason.[1] He is ours
To administer, to guard, to adorn the state,
But not to warp, or change it.

We love the man, the paltry pageant you;
We the chief patron of the commonwealth,
You the regardless author of its woes,
We for the sake of liberty, a king,
You chains and bondage for a tyrant's sake.

So the Whig Englishman rebukes foreigners and Tories, though he is so loud in his praise of George III that his mentor says he will be suspected of "patriotism."

All constraint,
Except what wisdom lays on evil men,
Is evil,

says Cowper, and from this formative Whig doctrine easily deduces the benefits of free trade;

. . . the band of commerce was designed
To associate all the branches of mankind.

Each climate needs what other climes produce
And offers something to the general use.

Commerce

Spreads foreign wonders in his country's sight
Imports what others have invented well
And stirs his own to match them or excel.
'Tis thus reciprocating each with each
Alternately the nations learn and teach,
While Providence enjoins to every soul
A union with the vast terraqueous whole.
Heaven speed the canvas, gallantly unfurled
To furnish and accommodate a world,
To give the pole the produce of the sun,
And knit the unsocial climates into one.

Here is the seed which when germinated and fully matured will bring forth Richard Cobden, the complete Manchester School, the Crystal Palace, and the Great Exhibition of 1851.

These being his opinions, Cowper reads English history as we should expect. In *Expostulation* he gives a bird's eye view of it. Except Magna Carta he finds nothing to praise in the priest and king-ridden Middle Ages, "tedious years in Gothic darkness past." He loves the names of Hampden and Sidney. The Commonwealth he seems to regard as a good thing rather overdone, not as the unforgivable political sin. He is tempted to think that with Chatham true patriotism ended.

In him Demosthenes was heard again,
Liberty taught him her Athenian strain.
His speech, his form, his action full of grace
And all his country beaming in his face,
He stood, as some inimitable hand
Would strive to make a Paul or Tully stand.

[1] Note the word: it rings true to 1649. Charles I was executed on a charge of high treason.

Yet he is careful to add that if political virtue is rare in England, there is at all events more in England than anywhere else: bad as his country may be, it is incomparably better than the rest.

> Why, having kept good faith, and often shown
> Friendship and truth to others, find'st thou none?
> Thou that has set the persecuted free
> None interposes now to succour thee.
> Countries indebted to thy power, that shine
> With light derived from thee, would smother thine;
> The very children watch for thy disgrace,
> A lawless brood, and curse thee to thy face.

The glory of England in Cowper's eyes, apart from true religion, is its constitution. In this especially is seen its superiority to foreigners; but indeed when Cowper thinks of foreigners he almost always means the French. He refers to few others. For him the Frenchman is the foreigner *par excellence*. Mild and pacific as he is, he has the true traditional Englishman's feeling about France, fanned by 100 years of war. Writing a few years before the Revolution, he reproaches France with

> Her house of bondage worse than that of old
> Which God avenged on Pharaoh—the Bastille.
> Ye dungeons, and ye cages of despair.

The Bastille, he says with a certain malicious pleasure in the remembrance of English victories, is

> . . . opprobrious more
> To France than all her losses and defeats
> Old or of later date, by sea or land.

Yet, with that English generosity for our enemies which is so often mistaken abroad for hypocrisy, he concludes that

> There's not an English heart that would not leap
> To hear that ye were fall'n at last; to know
> That even our enemies, so oft employed
> In forging chains for us, themselves were free.

He never wearies of girding at France. He cannot forget the part of France in the revolt of the American colonists:—

> True, we may thank the perfidy of France
> That picked the jewel out of England's crown
> With all the cunning of an envious shrew.

And so, with bitter satire, he exults that, though in recent years we have been "to the very beard braved and defied" in "our own sea" by the French,

> We yet retain
> Some small pre-eminence, we justly boast
> At least superior jockeyship, and claim
> The honours of the turf as all our own.

"Go then," he says to the young English bloods who were setting the fashion in racing in France just before the Revolution,

be grooms, and win the plate
Where once your nobler fathers won a crown.
'Tis generous to communicate your skill
To those that need it.

Nor is Cowper free from another English prejudice. He is not over-fond of the Scotch. This prejudice he does not parade like the last, but it peeps out, as when, quite in the manner of the Saxon reaction from Burns and Barrie, he sniffs at

him who strains his all into a song,
Perhaps some bonny Caledonian air
All birks and braes, though he was never there.

Echoes of the great struggle over the privileges of the East India Company and the Hastings trial reach us. Cowper had been at Westminster with Impey and Hastings, and personal memories sharpened his interest. He had enough loyalty to old times to insert in the newspapers six lines in defence of Hastings's character as he remembered it.

Nor well can I believe thee, gentle then,
Now grown a villain and the worst of men.

But of the general situation he writes, apostrophizing England,

Hast thou, though suckled at fair Freedom's breast,
Exported slavery to the conquered East?
Pull'd down the tyrants India served with dread
And raised thyself, a greater, in their stead?

He deplores the political influence of the Nabob at home; and noting the common tendency of public morals to be lower than those of the individual—

Hence chartered boroughs are such public plagues—

he illustrates it by the East India Company. Merchants blameless in private life, no sooner gain a charter than they lose their nature,

Build factories with blood, conducting trade
At the sword's point, and dyeing the white robe
Of innocent commercial justice red.

The rising tide of evangelical humanitarianism that was soon to end the slave trade, and later slavery itself, pulses in his verse time and again. There is a reference to Lord Mansfield's judgment in Sommersett's case, 1772, ten years before, allowing the grant of *Habeas Corpus* to a negro slave in this country because there is no slave status in England.

Slaves cannot breathe in England; if their lungs
Receive our air, that moment they are free.
They touch our country and their shackles fall.
That's noble . . :
We have no slaves at home. Then why abroad?

He pours scorn on the argument that slavery is necessary for the cultivation of the sugar cane. Expediency will justify anything—that ruffian with his dagger in your house,

Not he, but his emergence, forced the door,
He found it inconvenient to be poor.

In home affairs the Whig point of view is as clear. Cowper dislikes the Tory country parson magistrate and plainly suggests that he is very corruptible by bribes.

The plump convivial parson often bears
The magisterial sword in vain.

Either he is afraid of violence or "tribute, game or fish, wild fowl or venison" has defiled his palm. Cowper, though a consistent member of the Establishment, has the traditional Whig sympathy with the Dissenters, still under all the civil disabilities of the Restoration persecution, barred from office, schools, and universities. His denunciation of the sacramental test for office is, of course, famous. Cowper addresses England:—

Hast thou by statute shoved from its design
The Saviour's feast, His own blest bread and wine;
And made the symbols of atoning grace
An office key, a picklock to a place,
That infidels may prove their title good
By an oath dipped in sacramental blood?
A blot that still will be a blot, in spite
Of all that grave apologists may write;
And though a bishop toil to cleanse the stain,
He wipes and scours the silver cup in vain.

There is more than Whig tradition behind this. Cowper's religious conviction led him to feel more kinship with orthodox evangelical Dissenters than with the rationalistic Deistic clergy of the Establishment. He is nothing if not orthodox. He has one explicit reference to the creeds; the Colonel, one of a set of rascals set up to be knocked down, is made to speak disrespectfully of them:—

My creed (says the colonel) whatever some creedmakers mean
By Athanasian nonsense or Nicene,
My creed is, he is safe that does his best.

Cowper has no use for this slovenliness in doctrine. He laments that

Truth is hushed, that Heresy may preach;
And all is trash that Reason cannot reach,

a glance at the silencing of orthodox preachers, like George Whitefield and John Wesley, in the Church, whilst latitudinarian bishops fill the bench.

The royal letters are a thing of course.
A king that would might recommend his horse.
And Deans no doubt and Chapters with one voice
As bound in duty would confirm the choice.
Behold your bishop: well he plays his part
Christian in name and infidel in heart,
Ghostly in office, earthly in his plan,
A slave at court, elsewhere a lady's man.
Dumb as a senator, and as a priest
A piece of mere church furniture at best.

It is surely to the semi-schismatic Countess of Huntingdon, Selina, that he refers in his couplet:—

> We boast some rich ones whom the gospel sways
> And one who wears a coronet and prays.

He has been emphasizing St. Paul's observation "not many mighty, not many noble are called."

Another touch of Whiggism is in Cowper's moderation about the Romish Church. There is, to be sure, a reference to Edward VI as the equal of Alfred the Great, which only Protestant enthusiasm can support, and there is a grotesquely charming glimpse of Bonner outlined by Bloody Mary's fires at Smithfield:—

> Bonner, blithe as shepherd at a wake,
> Enjoyed the show, and danced about the stake.

There is a lament that, soon after the preaching of Christianity here,

> Rome, with sorceries and magic wand,
> Soon raised a cloud that darkened every land,
> And thine[1] was smothered in the stench and fog
> Of Tiber's marshes and the papal bog.

The contrast of the cruel Spanish treatment of the Incas with Captain Cook's humaneness in the South Seas is drawn to the discredit of Romanism. The Crusades are caricatured as a dodge concerning

> an empty tomb
> That proved a mint of wealth, a mine to Rome.

But for the rest, though Cowper never wearies of glorying in the freedom of the Protestant religion, he has few harsh words for Rome. He was indeed a personal friend of Papists.

What was Cowper's attitude to the social questions of his day? He is a stout supporter of his class. As his country with all its defects has still more virtue than all its neighbours taken together, so the middle-class in a degenerate age may still be considered comparatively virtuous.

> To you, then, tenants of life's middle state,
> Securely placed between the small and great,
> Whose character yet undebauched retains
> Two-thirds of all the virtue that remains.

His kindliness makes him most considerate for the poor, but he does not take the sentimental view that poverty is a synonym for virtue. He has no feeling that class distinctions are in themselves an offence. As an employer of a gardener he is

> conscious how much the hand
> Of lubbard Labour needs his watchful eye,
> Oft loitering lazily if not o'erseen
> Or misapplying his unskilful strength.

[1] England's.

Himself he does some work :—

> no works indeed
> That ask robust tough sinews bred to toil,
> Servile employ—but such as may amuse
> Not tire.

He disabuses teachers of the notion that the poor are more ready than the rich to learn Divine wisdom :—

> the poorest of the flock
> Are proud and set their faces as a rock.
> Denied that earthly opulence they choose,
> God's better gift they scoff at, and refuse.

He sets out his own opinion of the so-called gentleman and the so-called working-man. The gentleman is wise it he dismisses the squire " whose wit is rudeness, whose good breeding tires," and the parson " obsequious when abroad, though proud at home," and it in their place he seeks

> a more convenient friend
> With whom, dismissing forms, he may unbend—
> A man whom marks of condescending grace
> Teach, while they flatter him, his proper place—
> Who comes when called and at a word withdraws,
> Speaks with reserve and listens with applause,
> Some plain mechanic, who without pretence
> To birth or wit nor gives nor takes offence.

But if Cowper does not soften his words about " lubbard labour," he barbs them when he turns to those above the middle class. It is almost impossible to select quotations : the fashionable are always the chosen quarry of the moralist. But attacks on public schools, the universities, and the grand tour (the three ingredients in the education of the great) will suffice.

> Would you your son should be a sot or dunce
> Lascivious, headstrong, or all these at once?

Send him to school;

> Schools, unless discipline were doubly strong,
> Detain their adolescent charge too long;
> The management of tyros of eighteen
> Is difficult, their punishment obscene.

What then?

> Send him to College. If he there be tamed,
> Or in one article of vice reclaim'd,
> Where no regard of ordinances is shown,
> Or looked for now, the fault must be his own.

Here is the sting :

> The great indeed, by titles, riches, birth,
> Excused the encumbrance of more solid worth,
> Are best disposed of where with most success
> They may acquire that confident address,
> Those habits of profuse and lewd expense,
> That scorn of all delights but those of sense,
> Which though in plain plebeians we condemn
> With so much reason all expect from them.

After school and college the grand tour only is needed to complete the education of a gentleman. Did not Lord Bacon say: "Travel in the younger sort is a part of education"? "With reverend tutor clad in habit lay" off goes the young man. Ironically Cowper describes the adventures of the two:—

> Surprised at all they meet, the gosling pair
> With awkward gait, stretched neck, and silly stare,
> Discover huge cathedrals built with stone
> And steeples towering high much like our own,
> But shew peculiar light by many a grin
> At popish practices observed within.

Picked up by "some bowing smirking smart Abbé," they observe

> . . . inscriptions wheresoe'er they tread
> Such as when legible were never read.

Their kindly guide, too,

> sells them medals, which if neither rare
> Nor ancient, will be so, preserved with care.

Returning after such exertions, the young squire illustrates in his own person

> How much a dunce that has been sent to roam
> Excels a dunce that has been kept at home.

Far more important than these distinctions of class and class in Cowper's eyes is the more fundamental distinction between townsman and countryman. Cowper has the countryman's instincts and prejudices and point of view perfect. When he writes of the country, whether well or ill, he writes as only a countryman can. He describes the scenes, the operations, the effects that strike a man who knows what is going on in the countryside, for whom the changing face of the field and woodland is not merely the cardboard background of a char-a-banc trip or a cockney sportsman's day among the birds.

> God made the country and man made the town.
> The town has tinged the country.

That is the burden of what he has to say, but it is no mere pastoral lament. The meaning of the new money for the countryside—the Nabob's money from India and the manufacturer's money from the first industrial revolution—Cowper draws with a realism that leaves our professional, advertising realists where they always were, in fancies of their own. These people often seem to imagine that a new moneyed class for the first time invades rural England. Cowper knows better. Those splendid eighteenth century houses in park and woodland, the stately homes of England, he saw them all going up, raw from the builders' hands, on the sites of the older, irregular halls of earlier, poorer squires, the very mark of the new rich. He contrasts "England now" with

What England was, plain, hospitable, kind,
And undebauched. But we have bid farewell
To all the virtues of those better days
And all their honest pleasures. Mansions once
Knew their own masters, and laborious hinds,
That had survived the father, served the son.
Now the legitimate and rightful lord
Is but a transient guest, newly arrived,
And soon to be supplanted. He that saw
His patrimonial timber cast its leaf
Sells the last scantling, and transfers the price
To some shrewd sharper ere it buds again.
Estates are landscapes, gazed upon awhile,
Then advertized and auctioneer'd away.

Improvement (note the eighteenth century slogan).

Improvement, too, the idol of the age,
Is fed with many a victim. Lo! he comes—
The omnipotent magician, Brown, appears.
Down falls the venerable pile, the abode
Of our forefathers, a grave whiskered race,
But tasteless. Springs a palace in its place
But in a distant spot, where more exposed
It may enjoy the advantage of the north
And aguish east, till time shall have transformed
These naked acres to a sheltering grove.
He speaks. The lake in front becomes a lawn . . .

and so on. Is not that comment on the ill-chosen site the very echo of shrewd, waspish village talk about the new mansion?

For Cowper knows how they talk in the village. He knows *them*. He knows the social events in the village calendar, "a wrestling-match, a foot-race, or a fair." He knows how the labourer treasures his one or two good bits of furniture, his grandfather's "skillet and old carved chest," and contrives in the worst of times to save them from public sale. He knows how the sheepish boy on whom the lot fell to be a soldier comes back a well set up fellow almost too smart for the plough, driving his cattle to a march, looked up to with horrified admiration by the other boys in the village for the richness and variety of his swearing, for his tastes in drinks, and for his cheery disregard of all Sunday conventions.

Cowper is quite clear about this homeliness of the countryside to the countryman which no townsman can acquire. Country joys, he knows, are not to be picked up by some "insipid citizen," the man who thinks he will settle in the country, as one might move out to Richmond or Kew. He draws a vivid picture of the statesman, worn out by the cares of office, determined to renew his youth in country life. For a time the new sensation pleases; but it palls.

To cross his ambling pony day by day
Seems at the best but droning life away;
The prospect, such as might enchant despair,
He views it not or sees no beauty there.
With aching heart and discontented looks
Returns at noon to billiards or to books.

He cannot live without the familiar duties of office, and at last

> Flies to the levee, and, received with grace,
> Kneels, kisses hands, and shines again in place.

Lord Grey's recently published memoirs contain a confession interesting to compare with this.

Yet even the most unrelenting yokel of us must admit that Cowper is a bit of a snob in his bantering of the growing suburbia of his day. Villa gardens, he sneers, like the spoutless tea-pot turned window box in the slums, proclaim man's ineradicable love of nature.

> A garden in which nothing thrives has charms
> That soothe the rich possessor,

easily pleased, as he is, by "some sprigs of mournful mint." "Suburban villas, highwayside retreats," two miles out of town, a pleasant walk on a fine day and a stage coach journey on a wet day —these indeed

> Delight the citizen, who gasping there
> Breathes clouds of dust and calls it country air.

It is rural, they say, as they sit crammed in their parlours:

> trees are to be seen
> From every window and the fields are green.
> Ducks paddle in the pond before the door.

What more is wanted? Oh, nothing, says Cowper: if people like walking on turnpike roads, they are well employed in doing so.

Cowper, it must be confessed, had not the countryman's love of sport. What do you expect of a man who calls shooting "the explosion of the levell'd tube"? But his bitterest word is of course for the urban sportsman who, but for game, would find fields and groves merely "hideous nurseries of the spleen"; and those of us who have watched the population of Leeds waiting for grouse on our fells would not have him mollify a syllable.

Without undue reading between the lines, then, we can discern much of the change and the problem of eighteenth century English society. There are references by name to many public characters and events. Cowper addresses to Lord Chesterfield, under the name Petronius, some moral advice which it is to be feared would have done little good to that "greybeard corrupter of our listening youth." He recounts the almost divine adoration offered to Voltaire in Paris immediately before his death. He prophesies that very soon people will

> Strut and storm and straddle, stamp and stare,
> To shew the world how Garrick did not act.

Lover as he was of Handel, "the more than Homer of his age," he cannot withhold his melancholy satire from those who are

> Commemoration mad; content to hear
> (Oh wonderful effect of music's power!)
> Messiah's eulogy for Handel's sake.

He recounts the beneficial results of the missions to Greenland by the Moravians, fired by " zeal peculiar " to plant

> sweet Sharon's rose
> On icy plains and in eternal snows.

Of the older writers he praises most Milton, and, though he professes appreciation of the " humorous vein, strong sense, and simple style " that he dare not mention " so despised a name," he anticipates modern of Bunyan. He cries shame on the skulking magistrates who suffered the Gordon Riots to make blazing London seem a second Troy. With the humanitarian spirit of his time Cowper calls for law reforms: the relics of ecclesiastical law at Doctors Commons should disappear. He praises Howard's exertions for prison improvement and calls for an end of imprisonment for debt: "insolvent innocence" should go free. Yet Cowper is no sentimentalist, but, like the Puritan radical who demands a freer use of the cat for certain offenders, he longs for " a law to noose the villain's neck " who starves his family for the sake of drink.

Public opinion is rising against duelling. Fear, not courage, says Cowper, carries it on, " fear lest fops should censure us and fools should sneer." He settles the question tersely:—

> Am I to set my life upon a throw
> Because a bear is rude and surly? No.
> A moral, sensible and well-bred man
> Will not affront me and no other can.

Everyone knows the heavy semi-classical terraces, crescents, and squares of the older seaside towns. These were to be built to house the same new rich whom we have already watched in the shires at work on their stately country houses in a similar Italian style. With a little help from Cowper we can follow the fashionable trek to the coast, in his days a new thing. We see the family established on the front, the girls out in the morning, riding "with some unmeaning coxcomb " at their side. We can almost see the bathers.

> Your prudent grandmammas, ye modern belles,
> Content with Bristol, Bath, and Tunbridge Wells,
> When health required it, would consent to roam,
> Else more attach'd to pleasures found at home;
> But now alike gay widow, virgin, wife,
> Ingenious to diversify dull life,
> In coaches, chaises, caravans, and hoys
> Fly to the coast for daily, nightly joys,
> And all, impatient of dry land, agree
> With one consent to rush into the sea.

Hitherto Cowper had thought of the sea as serviceable to illustrate the power and majesty of its Maker, and is but doubtful about this modern use of it.

Several other fashionable habits he comments on. There is the craze for novels

> Whose corresponding misses fill the ream
> With sentimental frippery and dream,
> Caught in a delicate, soft, silken net
> By some lewd earl, or rakehell baronet.
>
> . . . authors hear at length one general cry,
> Tickle and entertain us, or we die.
>
> And novels (witness every month's review)
> Belie their name, and offer nothing new.

Smoking and tea drinking Cowper finds well established social habits. The one he deplores, but confesses himself a slave to the other; he

> with a quiet which no fumes disturb,
> Sips meek infusions of a milder herb.

The Press is beginning to make itself felt. Cowper is not sure about it—good or evil?

> Thou fountain, at which drink the good and wise,
> Thou ever bubbling spring of endless lies.

Yet he admits his eagerness to read the "folio of four pages" over tea on a winter evening: news of the troops in the Thirteen Colonies, "Is India free . . . or do we grind her still?" and, though "the dearth of information and good sense" of which the editor bashfully warns us is always there, Cowper finds good reading at least in the advertisements:—

> roses for the cheeks
> And lilies for the brows of faded age,
> Teeth for the toothless, ringlets for the bald,
> Heaven, earth, and ocean plundered of their sweets,
> Nectareous essences, Olympian dews,
> Sermons and city feasts, and favourite airs,
> Aetherial journeys, submarine exploits,

and so on.

Cowper, like most sensible men, was acutely aware that the prejudices of his own generation were not more respectable than those of any other and that its fashions of thought deserved no more deference. Yet like all men, sensible and foolish, he bore very clearly stamped on what he said and did the character of his own times. He could not avoid the atmosphere of the late eighteenth century. He might rail at Deistic clergymen and at those who

> drill and bore
> The solid earth, and from the strata there
> Extract a register, by which we learn
> That He Who made it, and reveal'd its date
> To Moses (!), was mistaken in its age;

but he constantly uses the argument from design so typical of the divines whom he dislikes. He is fired too by the same rather naive

enthusiasm for natural science or natural philosophy as the men whom he criticizes. Thus with a conciser wit than that which is elongated and attenuated in Mr. Shaw's *Preface on Parents and Children* Cowper dismisses the " public hackneys in the schooling trade," who have little to offer children but " conjugated verbs and nouns declined," and calls on every father who is " blest with any brains "

> To lead his son, for prospects of delight,
> To some not steep, though philosophic height,

to shew him the stars, the moons of Jupiter, and

> Saturn's belted ball,
> And the harmonious order of them all;
> To shew him in an insect or a flower,
> Such microscopic proof of skill and power,
> As, hid from ages past, God now displays
> To combat atheists with in modern days.

The argument may be sound, but it puts Cowper in company he would not like.

In his opinions on what might now be called sociology the aroma of the Encyclopaedist is as discernible as that of the Deist in his divinity. The hard natural conditions of Patagonia and Lapland seem to him the cause of the selfish craftiness of the natives, as the luxurious productions of the South Sea Islands explain the loose morality there. Do you not recognize Montesquieu's *L'Espirit des Lois* (and its pedestrian successors) in this sketch of the influences of geographical environment? It is almost airy enough to be called a scientific treatment of history.

What power, Cowper asks,

> maintains
> A Briton's scorn of arbitrary chains?

and he answers

> They take, perhaps, a well-directed aim,
> Who seek it in his climate and his frame.

The severe climate (often contrasted with the more genial climate of Popish lands) rears Nature's " favourite man of all mankind " with " a mind well lodged and masculine of course." The rigour of the English seasons produces a form " half muscle and half bone " and a " meek manliness of soul "

> Patient of constitutional control.
> But if authority grow wanton, woe
> To him that treads upon his free-born toe!
> One step beyond the boundary of the laws
> Fires him at once in Freedom's glorious cause.

The French climate, as it is softer, does not produce this constitutional mixture of muscle, bone and spirit.

> The Frenchman, easy, debonair, and brisk,
> Give him his lass, his fiddle, and his frisk,
> Is always happy, reign whoever may.

He drinks his simple beverage with a gust,
And feasting on an onion and a crust,
We never feel the alacrity and joy
With which he shouts and carols *Vive le Roi.*

As we derided the Germans for living on black bread and horse sausage for a decade before our struggle with them, Cowper on the eve of the Revolutionary war laughed at the Frenchman's crust and onion feast. A belief in the superiority of his diet is no unimportant or unsubstantial foundation for the political faith and confidence of an Englishman.

Highbrow circles of the late eighteenth century affected classical enthusiasm with a vigour indistinguishable from silliness. The cult was more extreme in France than in this country, but Cowper notes that even in England in a half-serious, half-comic way people are disposed to revive long-discarded fables. The countryside rings again with the names of Jupiter, Venus, Mercury; shrines for them appear in country house grounds; and men

having proved the weakness, it should seem,
Of revelation's ineffectual beam
They mean to try what may at last be done
By stout substantial gods of wood and stone.

Yet Cowper himself, anticipating the midsummer madness of the early Revolution, professes to be ready to build altars to *Liberty,* to deck them with flowers, and at sunrise and sunset to perform thankful rites before them. Shocking! We can almost descry the altars of the Fatherland, of Nature, and of Reason itself.

It is but right to say that Cowper, always so ready to see the ludicrous side of anything, even of himself, at once pulls in. In his wildest ravings about Liberty he never loses his sense of humour; it is the one serious modification of his Whiggism. This dialogue is an illustration:—

B. Place me where Winter breathes his keenest air,
And I will sing, if Liberty be there;
And I will sing at Liberty's dear feet,
In Afric's torrid clime, or India's fiercest heat.

A. Sing where you please; in such a cause I grant
An English poet's privilege to rant.

"An English poet": this paper has said nothing of Cowper as a poet; it has but noted his political asides. These, however, may well convince us that if we were asked to name a man typical of what is most characteristic of the best side of English life—its permanent, genial, solid qualities—we should have to think long before we could find a name to set beside that of William Cowper. He illustrates most of the qualities that distinguish the good Englishman from the good foreigner (to use an inexact but intelligible classification that would have pleased him): a countryman and a lover of the country-

side; a Whig, that is to say a patriot not merely as a Tory or a foreigner may be a patriot, but a patriot peculiarly appreciative of our English parliamentary traditions, loyal to mild monarchy, rejoicing with a slightly superior air in that unique turn in our constitutional development which has saved us alone of all the world from the tyranny alike of monarchs and of revolutionaries; pious but utterly unclerical in point of view; critical of prelates and quietly scornful of those shallow persons who can see at a glance through the whole sham of the Christian religion; never taking himself too seriously and always ready to smile at his own extravagances; tender, sympathetic, appreciative of every place and person and point of view that he knows, but preserving himself from insipid sentimentality by sharpening his satiric wit on places and persons and points of view of which he is grotesquely ignorant; insular and rustic, but scholarly and gentle, a sort of etherealized and evangelized John Bull.

Let the conclusion of the whole matter be some lines which shew no few of these qualities: the careful, penetrating sight, the love of the plainest English scene, bare of all mountain romance and melodramatic glamour, the very elements of the English countryside.

> Here Ouse, slow winding through a level plain
> Of spacious meads with cattle sprinkled o'er,
> Conducts the eye along his sinuous course
> Delighted. There, fast rooted in their bank
> Stand, never overlook'd, our favourite elms,
> That screen the herdsman's solitary hut;
> While far beyond, and overthwart the stream,
> That as with molten glass inlays the vale,
> The sloping land recedes into the clouds;
> Displaying on its varied side the grace
> Of hedgerow beauties numberless, square tower,
> Tall spire, from which the sound of cheerful bells
> Just undulates upon the listening ear;
> Groves, heaths, and smoking villages remote.
> Scenes must be beautiful which daily view'd
> Please daily, and whose novelty survives
> Long knowledge and the scrutiny of years:
> Praise justly due to those that I describe.

And this, a winter picture:—

> I saw the woods and fields at close of day
> A variegated show; the meadows green
> Though faded; and the lands, where lately waved
> The golden harvest of a mellow brown,
> Upturn'd so lately by the forceful share;
> I saw far off the weedy fallows smile
> With verdure not unprofitable, grazed
> By flocks, fast feeding, and selecting each
> His favourite herb; while leafless groves,
> That skirt the horizon wore a sable hue,
> Scarce noticed in the kindred dusk of eve.

B. L. Manning.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS.

This Section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN AMERICA.[1]

It may be of interest to British readers to learn of the progress of religious education in America. The writer is unaware how far the development that has taken place in American churches and theological schools has been paralleled in Great Britain.

The religious education movement in any technical sense is only about twenty years old with us. In 1908 Dr. T. G. Soares was appointed " Professor of Homiletics and Religious Education " in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago. So far as I know he was the first teacher in an American theological school to bear the last half of this title. In 1909 Prof. George A. Coe was appointed Professor of Practical Theology in Union Seminary in New York. Though there was no recognition of it in his title, Prof. Coe's work was from the beginning in the field of religious education. Very soon after this instructors in the same field were introduced into other theological schools. But Profs. Coe and Soares illustrate what was true of most or all of the earlier instructors in this work in the earlier years; each of them was the only instructor in his department in his school, and each one of them gave only a part of his time to religious education. The *Circular of Information* of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago for 1908-1909 lists Prof. Soares as offering seven courses on religious education; two were on " The History of Religious Education," one on " Religious Education in the Catholic Church," one on " The History of the Sunday School," and one each on " The Materials of Religious Education," " Introduction

1 This article makes no attempt to describe the work of the Religious Education Association, which has been operating now for more than twenty years, with an annual conference and attended by many leading educators of America, and with a bi-monthly publication widely read and of great value. Such a description would require an article by itself. The influence of this Association has been very great.

to Religious Education," " The Religious Education of the Adult," and " The State and Religious Education." It also lists nine or ten courses offered by Prof. Soares in Homiletics. The *Catalogue* of Union Theological Seminary for the year 1909-1910 shows Prof. Coe offering eight courses—" Introduction to the Psychology of Religion," " Religious Education," " Adolescence," " The Sunday School," " Mental Hygiene and Therapeutics," " Church and State in Education," "The Psychology of Mysticism," and also a seminar on " Tests of Efficiency in Religious and Moral Education." Two of these courses were given in alternate years only.

How far we have progressed from these beginnings may be seen by a glance at the latest *Catalogues* of these same two institutions. The Chicago Divinity School has two full professors of religious education and one assistant professor: the *Annual Register* (*1927-1928*) shows thirty-four courses in religious education given during the year by seven different instructors. A few of the fundamental courses bear the same names as those in the earlier *Catalogues* —" Principles of Religious Education," " Materials of Religious Education," and " The Religious Education of the Adult." Others show how much specialization has been introduced in recent years: "Week-Day Religious and Daily Vacation Bible Schools," " Introduction to Measurement in Religious Education," " The Religious Education of the College Student," " Curriculum Construction," *etc.* The *Catalogue* of Union Seminary for 1927-1928 shows not so large an offering, but gives evidence of a similar specialization in courses on " Group Thinking," " Work with Individuals," " Experimental Research in Religious Education," "Psychological Approach to the Study of Religious Experience." The *Catalogue* of the Yale Divinity School, the School of Religious Education at Boston University, the Garrett Biblical Institute, and the Hartford School of Religious Education show similar attention to the subject.

How many men and women are now engaged in the teaching of religious education in America cannot be stated with entire accuracy. The *Year Book of the National Council of Religious Education* for 1929 gives a list of " Professors of Religious Education " containing 376 names, 35 of whom are women. The title is explained as covering " those responsible for one or more courses in religious education in the technical use of that term." It is not to be supposed therefore that all of these persons are giving all their time to this work. Nor are they all employed by any means in theological schools: only about 50 or 60 of them appear to be teaching in such institutions, about 35 of which are represented in this list. The rest are employed in teachers' colleges, religious colleges, even in agricultural colleges, and in universities both privately endowed and supported by the State. They are scattered throughout the country, Illinois having the largest number, 42, and New York coming next with 36. Ohio

has 29, Texas 22, Massachusetts 17, Indiana, Missouri and California have 13 each. Thirty-nine States are represented in the list, six with only one name each. Even when allowance is made for those who teach only part time, the list is a formidable one. Practically all denominations are represented in it.

One naturally asks how far the churches have accepted this movement and availed themselves of the services of persons who have been trained by all this teaching. Here also it is not possible to be entirely accurate. Undoubtedly many, both men and women, have taken a course or several courses in religious education in the universities, the theological colleges or the normal schools, and have gone back into the churches to work in the Sunday Schools. Of such no enumeration can be made. The latest *Year Book of the National Council of Religious Education* lists 598 persons who are employed as " directors of religious education " in churches. Allowance must be made for 92 of these who seem to be temporarily out of position, and for students in theological schools who are employed to direct religious education in neighbouring churches, who are not fully equipped for specialized work of this kind, and who do not intend to follow it beyond their Seminary period but will go into the regular ministry. It might perhaps be safe to say that there are from 400 to 450 persons who have had reasonably adequate training, who intend to follow religious education as a calling, and who are now employed by individual churches in the capacity of directors of religious education. Ninety-five of these have " Rev." before their names, which presumably indicates that they are graduates of some theological school, though this would not always be the case. The same title may be taken in some instances to mean that those who bear it are " assistant pastors," who combine other duties with their religious education, and many of whom will later take pastorates of their own. 318 out of the 598 are women, 280 men. The Presbyterians seem to have taken more appreciatively to this religious educational work than any other denomination, heading the list with 116 employed directors; the Methodists come next with 109; the Congregationalists have 81; the Baptists 46. This distribution is not to be taken as an indication of the interest of the various denominations in religious education; the Lutherans and Episcopalians cannot be suspected of any lack of such interest, though apparently they employ few directors of religious education in comparison with some other denominations.

To pursue this matter slightly more in detail in our own denomination. The State of Minnesota has 214 Congregational churches, but only three of these employ directors of religious education. Three of our fifty churches in Missouri have directors; in Southern California ten churches out of 120 have them; in a group of six States in the " Middle Atlantic District " there are 156 churches of our

order, and perhaps six directors; in Montana with 107 churches, South Dakota with 211, and Indiana with 30, there are none. Kansas has 112 churches and only one director of religious education; Iowa has 251, with five directors; there is one director in North Dakota, which has 191 churches, and in New York there seem to be 14 directors for 299 churches. These States have 1,757 Congregational churches, but only 49 directors of religious education.

This again is not to be taken as indicating a lack of interest in this matter. A glance at the grouping of directors will show that they are almost all in the cities; the three in Missouri are all in Kansas City; of the 14 directors in New York, 11 are in New York City and the metropolitan district; the six directors in Ohio are all in the cities. The reason is the simple one that none but the city churches can afford the salary of a director. Several of the State Superintendents,[1] in response to my requests for information, remarked that in their States it was all most of the churches could do to pay one man without attempting to pay two. The States which show no directors at all are chiefly agricultural States with few if any large cities. The director of religious education, in other words, is a luxury that most churches cannot afford, no matter how valuable they may recognize him to be.

Where churches have tried the employment of a director and have later gone back to voluntary service, the reasons seem to be various. Sometimes the director, while well trained in the theory and technique of the schools, has lacked the practical experience or the natural qualities necessary for leadership. Sometimes the church has found that his employment did not increase the revenues of the church as much as the amount of his salary expended in some other way would do. Sometimes the director has required an expensive equipment which overloaded the budget till it ended in his leaving. More often, probably, the minister himself has not taken the director of religious education seriously or appreciatively enough; he has not given him his end of the church work, and his liberty in doing it, holding him responsible for results, but has wanted him to be a sort of pastor's assistant and man-of-all-work. These reasons taken together are quite enough to account for the fact that in proportion to the amount of time and energy spent on this subject in the theological schools the actual number of directors in our Sunday Schools seems small, and does not appear to be growing as rapidly as one might expect.

There is another movement that has grown out of the employment of directors of religious education, or out of the interest generated by the whole discussion of religious education, and that is the employment of paid teachers in the Sunday Schools. The same causes—lack of money, lack of interest, or mere conservatism—that work

1 Corresponding to the Moderators in English Congregationalism.—Ed.

against the employment of a director, would work even more strongly against the paying of teachers. Indeed very few Sunday Schools have yet attempted this venture. Some State Superintendents are against it on principle. One of them writes: "In so far as the movement to pay teachers is based upon a growing unwillingness to give time to the Lord's work, it is a sign of decay in our churches." A Congregational pastor says: "We do not pay any of our teachers. We once felt we would have to pay a teacher in our Beginners' Department. As soon as the matter was presented to our Superintendents it was voted down. Their objections were that the services ought to be free, and that we could not pay enough to make it worth while." The minister adds: "I feel that this is quite true. To pay a dollar isn't worth while." One other Superintendent writes: "A few of our churches pay some of the heads of their departments. When the financial element is introduced into the Church School, many others who are not now paid will desire compensation and will feel that invidious distinctions are being made if some are paid and some are not."

Much more valuable is the experience of the few churches that have actually tried this experiment. Six churches in Ohio, three of them in Cleveland, pay some or all of their teachers. The experience of one Congregational church in Chicago seems to be a direct reply to all the arguments urged above against such a procedure. Its pastor is the same man who began a similar custom in one of the Ohio churches just referred to. I quote from his letter in answer to my inquiry: "My first experience in the engaging of a Religious Work Director was in Toledo some ten years ago. He was a specially trained religious education director. We paid him 4,500 dollars a year, and the Bible School teachers associated with him were paid on an average of 1 dollar to 2 dollars per Sunday. This resulted in a very regular teaching corp, a high-grade teaching corp, and one that qualified from pedagogical efficiency as well as Christian character. It had a decidedly good effect upon the whole religious education department, instead of the haphazard and bad psychology that grows from the old conception of Sunday School . . . It resulted in almost 100 per cent of the junior department becoming members of the church . . . I am convinced that the employment of a religious director and the payment of qualified teachers to work under him is a movement in the right direction in handling the great and important matter of religious education."

For obvious reasons this custom of paying Sunday School teachers will probably not make rapid progress in America. But it may be a move in the right direction just the same. The experience just quoted covers two different churches and a period of more than ten years. One such experiment, issuing in such satisfactory results, is worth more than many arguments against it by men who have never tried it.

CARL S. PATTON.

YOUTH AND THE CHURCH.[1]

THE majesty of a mountain, the gentle rippling of a stream, the sting of the wind, the glory of a summer's day, in fact, no part of the wonder of Nature can fail to give a thinking man or woman a sense of oneness with God, a conviction of His presence in, and purpose for, the world. But the one place where Youth would expect to find Him, the one atmosphere in which He should be, too often seems to drain from a young man or woman that sense of wonder, that sureness of His presence, which he or she found in Nature: why is it that the churches are failing to help Youth to fit itself to modern life?

At a conference of the Auxiliary Movement at Welwyn, at Easter, were congregated some 100 men and women, mostly young, to discuss this very question—whether the Church had failed, and if so why. Perhaps it would be more true to say that the first Commission (for the conference worked in Commissions discussing the different aspects of the Church) consisting of about 20 people were discussing this question. Their attitude soon became apparent, and they were soon styled "heretics" or "rebels." I was a member of that Commission, and I think its conclusions were the conclusions of many thinking people about the Church.

First, let me say that we never gave a thought to the churches; for us there could only be one Church, and we were convinced that in a short time there would be only one Christian Church— a *united*, not a uniform Church.

The Commission met for three mornings; the first morning we gave to destructive criticism of the Church as we saw it, the second to defining the Church and its function, and the last to setting forth how we thought the existing churches could set about becoming the ideal "Church."

We had four main criticisms of the Church as we saw it:—

1. The Church shows a lifeless attitude to local affairs, social and otherwise.

2. The Church often fails to meet moral situations in a Christian way.

3. The Church has no welcome and clearly shows that it has no room for people who think for themselves.

4. The Church is too introvert. She seeks to preserve herself, and a certain static body of truth, leaving no room for the growth of knowledge.

The discussion on truth and the Church's jealousy on her own behalf led to the consideration of creeds. The majority of members of the group rejected creeds as completely unnecessary; a few saw some function for them, but not as they at present existed.

1 Having learnt that a group of young people had decided that the Church was "depressing, but inevitable," we invited one of them to describe their deliberations and state their conclusions. This is the resulting article.

We agreed that in all directions the Church seemed to lack a spirit of adventure. She seemed to consider it her job to help people to live better under their present conditions, no matter how bad they be, but did not seek in any way to better these conditions. The Church had no social philosophy, and seemed to have none of the Christian enthusiasm which one would expect to find in her; she did not seem eager to make experiments and forge ahead to social change. Further, the Church gave no Christian teaching on pressing problems of life as lived to-day, on such matters as investment, rent, interest, *etc.*—matters upon which men need guidance in every-day life.

Seeking for the reasons for these shortcomings of the Church we set forth the following:—

(*a*) The Church wastes energy in competition between its different parts, so that it loses sight of the big issues.

(*b*) There is too much emphasis on personal salvation, and not enough on acting for the common good.

(*c*) The Church is ignorant of the conditions of life in other societies. This has been demonstrated by the attitude of certain suburban congregations to the miners, who are assumed to be dangerous extremists. Of course this ignorance is not confined to the Church, but it is particularly deplorable in a Christian body, which should be setting forth the principles of Christ—friendship and love.

Having thus cleared the ground, and shown each other how we felt, we went on to consider the nature of the Church and its function in human society. After an account of the origin and history of the Church, it was asked whether it was possible for anyone to become a member of the true Christian fellowship without this approach through tradition. It was the opinion of the group that it was here that the Church vitally needed changing, and that full fellowship in the Christian Church should be offered to anyone who needed it and asked for it, whatever his approach. At this point, in discussing the need for a change of heart on the part of the churches with regard to the spreading of real fellowship, the group was forced to consider the relation between individual change and that of a community. It was agreed that the desired change of attitude must come in individuals as well as in the Church as a body, and that progress could only be measured by the increase in self-determination of members making up the body.

In discussing the nature of the Church we took the six criteria set forth in the Report of Section III of the World Conference on Faith and Order at Lausanne in 1927. We decided that in so far as we could accept any of them, the phraseology would have to be altered. We decided that four criteria were essential:—

(*a*) Christ must be the centre of a Christian fellowship; and since the Gospels draw His life, and indicate His principles, they must be accepted as important for the Church. In any thinking about the

Church we are forced back to the early disciples and their vision of the community of Christ's followers on earth.

(*b*) It was agreed that the Church must be based on a belief in God. This must be connected with the person of Jesus Christ; we felt that we could not define this, but would certainly not indicate it by any word such as " Incarnation," since this carries with it so many varying interpretations.

(*c*) In discussing the question of the " Cross " in the doctrine of the Church there was great division of opinion, but, though many said that sacrifice had come to be an end in itself, it was agreed that in a Christian fellowship service must be given to its fullest extent. In this way, and in the fact that many of the greatest things in life seemed to bring pain and suffering, it was recognized that there must be some eternal significance about it.

(*d*) In a Christian fellowship there must be the continuous attempt to share life to the utmost with people within and without the fellowship, and also some attempt to put into words the basis of the fellowship itself.

It was agreed that there must be preaching, but that more use must be made of discussion and the pooling of experience; that it was vital to the reconstruction at home that the best thought about life should be shared with less developed races. But preaching the Gospel abroad can be of no use without reform at home; the two must go side-by-side. New knowledge and understanding must be applied to all branches of life, and in all parts of the world.

In regard to " public worship " the group agreed that, since man is a social animal, he must share his God as he shares every other thing in his life. We did feel, however, that this worship must be linked up with the life and needs of the district in which the group is worshipping.

We thus concluded that the function of the Church was two-fold: (1) Teaching, (2) Supplying the means of fellowship.

We then came to the existing conditions in the Church and set about showing how we would see it reformed. We drew up a set of concrete proposals as follows:—

I. Every congregation should from time to time ask itself three questions:—

What is life given to us for?

What is our church for, and how far does it help in fulfilling the purpose of life?

What is the relation of our church to the neighbourhood in which it stands?

II. Every congregation should see that adequate instruction is being given to its members on such subjects as modern biblical scholarship; the conditions in and development of industry, com-

merce, and politics; international relations; sex matters. To this end each church should be equipped with a good library.

III. Now and again every congregation should reconsider the use of symbolism in its service, and if it should be found that this had lost its significance, should be ready either to abolish it or to reform it. The same applies to phraseology.

IV. There should be much greater variety in the services, both in regard to times and ceremonies.

It was agreed that it was a move in the right direction to provide an early service on Sunday for people going out for the rest of the day.

It was advocated that their rightful places should be given to poetry and art in the worship of the Church. Hymns should be used critically, and much better music provided for them. In this way much which seemed to lead people to God, now kept outside the Church, would lead them to Him through the Church.

V. It was felt that there was a great deal to be said for the Jewish attitude of preparation for the Sabbath. In many cases the Sunday services lost much of their value and significance through being isolated weekly events. We therefore suggested that each member of the congregation should regard it his duty to prepare his mind by thought and reading, making his Sunday begin, say, at 6 p.m. on Saturday.

VI. The Church should seriously take itself to task for the fact that at present the burden of Church work falls upon a few, in some cases to the danger of home and family life.

These are, briefly, the findings of the group. It may sound as if we criticised from outside and would have none of the Church for ourselves. We recognized the fact that it was not our place to stay outside and criticize something with which we had no sympathy, but to accept the responsibility and foster as far as possible in those churches to which we belong the spirit of reform and adventure, and thus help to bring about the ideal Church for which we look so eagerly.

ELSPETH COLLIER.

BAHAISM.

A MOVEMENT OF GREAT FUTURE SIGNIFICANCE.

TOWARDS the end of last year the London Daily Press contained reports of the remarkable and rapid spread of a new religon in Eastern and South-Eastern Europe. The accounts given of the character of this movement were largely inaccurate; it was, for example, stated that the backward and peasant populations only were affected, in fact, that the movement's appeal was solely in this direction. This can hardly be said to apply, however, to a movement which Jowett of Balliol once described as " the greatest light the world has seen since

Christ, although too great and too close for my generation to realize its full significance." Actually, this movement—Behaism or Bahaism as it is indifferently called—possesses, at least so far as the West is concerned, more attraction for the educated than for the illiterate, as it places little emphasis upon the ritual and symbolism appealing so strongly to the untutored. Nor can the movement be termed exactly new, since it originated in Persia nearly eighty years ago.

Bahaism is a force with which the future will have seriously to reckon. The English Assembly of Bahaism is already a powerful body, considerably more numerous and certainly more influential than the English establishments of other Eastern religions, than, for instance, the Buddha Society of Great Britain. Its membership also in the United States is large, and growing rapidly.

The progress and the future of Bahaism are of special interest to Christianity, for, unwelcome as such a conclusion may be, the trend of events at the present time is considerably more in favour of Bahaism than of Christianity itself. It may be contended that the former is merely a sect and in no sense a world religion, lacking even the local concentration of Taoism or Parseeism. This indeed is partly true, but the immense progress made by Bahaism all over the world during the post-war years is very significant and the probabilities are that in fifty years' time Christianity will be confronted with at least as formidable a rival as was " the religion of the Unconquered Sun " to the early Church; and with the important difference that circumstances will almost certainly be more in favour of Bahaism. Christianity as a world force is steadily losing ground. It has never looked less likely to consolidate its missionary efforts in the East, and in the West its frontiers remorselessly contract under the united influences of secularism and indifference. It is rent with schism; it has not yet recovered the blow which the attitude of its official representatives dealt its moral prestige during the war; and more gravely still, as regards the future, it shows no signs of arriving at that intellectual composition with scientific conclusions through which alone it can gain the assent of the best educated and most thoughtful opinion. These are unpleasant facts, but they are hardly controvertible.

Bahaism, on the other hand, is hampered by no such disabilities. Although of recent years there has been an interesting development of opinion away from the earlier, more anthropomorphic, to what may be termed the substantially modernist standpoint, there exists no cleavage comparable with that between the Christian Evangelical and the Ritualist, or between the latter and the Liberal. The movement presents a united front. Again, Bahaism has no such body of formal dogma as that which distinguishes Christianity, varying with each Church and constantly needing adjustment, and even abandonment,

as scientific knowledge advances. Moreover, it is one of the fundamental axioms of the movement that religion must accord with science. Thus it is in a strong position, for it cannot be doubted that the tendencies militating so strongly against dogmatic religion to-day will be accentuated as time goes on.

Bahaism is the work of three very remarkable men, of whom one at least was a religious mystic and genius of the highest class. Its beginnings parallel in a striking fashion those of Christianity. It began in Persia about the middle of the 19th century; in genesis it is an offshoot from Islam, more particularly from the Shiah sect. For many years previously the Persian Moslems had been awaiting the manifestation earlier promised—just as the Jews at the time of Christ's birth were expecting the Messiah. In the year 1844, Mirza Ali Muhammad, a Persian born at Shiraz and a lineal descendant of the Prophet, declared that he was the herald of the manifestation which was then imminent and which should usher in the new era of peace and happiness. He took the name of " Bab "—*the gate*—as signifying that he was the channel by which the divine grace was to come, and he displayed amazing energy and zeal in both writing and preaching of the deliverer who should follow him and who would redeem the world. The greatest excitement was caused in Persia, and the orthodox Shiahs were greatly alarmed. At length they persuaded the authorities to suppress the new heresy. The severest persecution of the Bab's followers ensued and he himself was arrested and imprisoned. Nevertheless he continued his preaching and writing and went a step further by announcing that he was the twelfth Iman, who had mysteriously disappeared a thousand years before and whose re-appearance was looked for by the faithful, and also by applying to himself the peculiar titles of the Prophet. As a result he was executed by shooting at the Citadel of Tabriz in 1850. His writings are remarkable for their lofty and unshakeable conviction, and also for the interpretations placed upon current beliefs. The resurrection, he taught, was the appearance of the Sun of Truth presently to be manifest and of which he was the forerunner. Thus the raising of the dead was the spiritual awakening of those in sin and lost to ultimate values; the day of judgment was the day of the manifestation, and paradise consisted in the joy of realizing and knowing God. His central themes were the love of God as universal father and the unity and the brotherhood of men; and thence developed the emancipation of women, the necessity of peace, and the care and maintenance of the unfortunate and the poor.

At the time of his execution a young Persian nobleman, Mirza Husayn Ali, was one of his most ardent followers. He also underwent imprisonment and was later banished. Some thirteen years afterwards, while still in exile, he announced that he was the chosen of God foretold by the Bab. Thereafter he went, still

by compulsion, to Acre in Palestine, where he remained in open confinement until his death in 1892. He assumed the title of "Baha'u'llah"—*the glory of God*—and was everywhere accepted by the followers of the Bab as the promised manifestation.

On his first arrival at Acre, Baha'u'llah despatched a remarkable series of letters to the Pope, the various crowned heads and presidents of republics, exhorting them to establish true religion and just government and to abolish war. These letters are noteworthy for their eloquence and depth of feeling. Obviously the writer was no ordinary man. This was borne out by the testimony of the late Professor E. G. Browne, a highly accomplished scholar, who visited him some years later, and was deeply impressed by his appearance and conversation. Throughout his life Baha'u'llah was unremitting in his work of preaching and writing, and Acre became the centre of a world-wide movement. By his will his son, Abdul Baha (the servant of Baha), was constituted his father's successor; the latter, however, claimed in no sense the same position. Upon his release from captivity he made a tour of Europe, visited London, and preached in the City Temple. On the outbreak of war, however, he became again the prisoner of the Turkish Government. He remained at Haifa until the Armistice, and was so active in relieving the distresses of the people and in organizing food production that he was given a Knighthood in 1920. He died a year later, delegating his charge to his son, Shoghi Effendi (the Guardian of the Cause).

Abdul Baha taught, wrote, and corresponded enormously during his last years. His revelation was that of his father, he himself being merely "the narrow and partial reflection of that light." Bahaism as taught by Baha'u'llah and Abdul Baha is sheerly monotheistic. It has no sort of ritual and practically no dogma. The Bahai does not worship Baha'u'llah, but the God of which he is the manifestation. Bahaism means simply loving humanity and trying to serve it, and working for universal peace and brotherhood. "Glory," said Baha'u'llah in the *Tablet of the World*, "is not his who loves his country but his who loves his kind."

There is no doubt that Baha'u'llah—he expressly declares so in his writings—thought of himself as the directly inspired mouthpiece of God: the one who in himself summed up the hopes and prophecies of other religions as being the deliverer who should inaugurate a new spiritual era. He taught, and Abdul Baha taught after him, that he was the divinely-appointed mediator between God and men. The latter even went so far as to deny the possibility of communication except through this channel. The emphasis, however, in present-day Bahaism is away from such an identification of the human with the divine. Baha'u'llah is revered as the unique inspiration of the movement, but the impulse to his actual deification is steadily waning and

now plays a smaller part in actual faith and practice than perhaps it does in any other world religion. It thus definitely responds to the modern trend of religious feeling which stresses incarnation doctrine less and concentrates more upon the direct and unmediated communion between man and the divine. Similarly the belief in miracles and in more primitive forms of inspiration is decreasing.

Such is a brief account of this remarkable movement. Its unique challenge lies in its insistence upon and incessant labour for great reforms such as universal peace and brotherhood, which are indeed the ideals of the other great world religions, but which do not seem their first business. As respects the future, Bahaism possesses especial importance as it offers to the increasing multitude outside the churches, impatient of dogma and the claims of supernaturalism, a religion of the spirit more satisfying and possible of far greater intellectual assent than the types of Christian Platonism, quietist Quakerism, or the various hybrids of occultism and denuded Jesusism now so much extolled and whose appeal is so partial and ephemeral.

J. L. T. E. Jones.

SALVAGING PERSONALITY.

Personality, next perhaps to *development,* is the most luminous concept of our time. It is one of those conceptions that arise like new orbs in the firmament of thought and shed fresh light on the path of human progress. The more it is explored and used the more worthful and potential it becomes.

Yet no sooner have we begun to enter more fully into the meaning of personality than we find ourselves confronted by two recent misuses of the term which tend to rob it of its higher meaning and envelope it in confusion.

The first of these is a rather trivial recent use of the term to designate those minor qualities of address, manners, carriage, *etc.,* which make a pleasant impression on others and further one's efficiency and social advancement. No doubt there is a place for this sort of self-cultivation. But it is most unfortunate that the term *personality,* whose roots go down so deep into philosophy, ethics, and religion, and whose history has prepared it for a far higher mission, should be captured and appropriated for so superficial a service. It is another instance of making Samson grind in the mills of the Philistines. Or, to change the figure, it is like taking the beautiful human face, which has required countless generations to fashion and render fit to express refined thoughts and gracious feelings, and robbing it of all expression, and daubing it with paints and cosmetics until it becomes a mere mask, behind which it is difficult to detect a living self at all. Not for such ends was this concept

personality stored with meaning, and launched upon its voyage of discovery and enrichment in behalf of the human spirit.

The other misfortune which has befallen the idea of personality is much more serious. It has been placed under the ban of certain types of psychology which—supposedly in the interest of a more scientific psychology—would rob it of all significance and throw it to the winds as a purely imaginary creation.

It is surprising to observe the unscientific precipitancy with which the "instinct psychology," behaviorism, and Freudian psycho-analysis have thrust aside introspective psychology and taken over the teaching of psychology in our American universities and colleges. Not that these new phases of psychology are false or worthless. On the contrary, each has contributed much to the understanding and practical direction of our mental life. Already the findings of experimental and abnormal psychology have been put to excellent service in psychiatry—although to substitute psychiatry for ethics and religion will prove in the end a more than doubtful gain. Such a book as Professor H. A. Overstreet's *About Ourselves,* which extracts all the values of the new psychology and then adds much more of its own, is full of practical wisdom and value and will help greatly to normalize and equip its readers to live more happily and helpfully. But it takes a genuine philosopher like Professor Overstreet to turn this new psychological material to good purpose. In less able hands it produces quite different results.

The trouble with these new branches of psychology is not that they do not furnish us with fresh and useful knowledge of mental activity, but that they claim the conquest of the whole field of mental life and seek to drive the idea of a self into exile as the bogy of an outworn introspective psychology. But happily the self is not so easily dispossessed. One may almost detect a smile on its face when the dust raised by its would-be despoilers settles a little. There is no reason to fear that the soul (or self) will be ejected, but there is much reason to fear that it will be lost hold of by a great many would-be *non-selves,* with serious consequences not only to morals and religion, but to themselves.

The virtual slogan of much recent psychology, "Back to the animal for a clue to mental life" may end in "Back to the animal for standards of mental attainment and moral conduct." That way lies *Moronism*; for the road back to the animal leads to something infinitely worse and lower than the animal. "Men are not animals erect," wrote Lord Bacon, "but immortal gods. The Creator has given us souls equal to all the world, and yet satiable not even with a world."

If such movements as these can be kept from submerging personal values we can go on into a much deeper and richer mining of the mother-lode of personality than has yet been effected. The advance

lies, it seems to me, in two parallel directions—a larger realization of (1) the powers, and (2) the possibilities, of personality.

(1) We need a very much larger conception of the powers with which the human self is endowed—reason, self-consciousness, unity, freedom, memory, imagination, creativeness. These powers are far greater and more expansive than have ever been realized. It is true that the increasing knowledge of our animal ancestry and nature is disclosing, as never before, the defects and limitations of our mental powers, but it is also disclosing as never before *how far these powers transcend the animal,* and is revealing the dignity and worth which their possession confers on every human being.

It is said that a lady who was once talking with Signor Marconi remarked upon how wonderful wireless telegraphy is, to which he replied, " Yes, Madam, but not half so wonderful as that you and I can talk together about it." Chester Rowell, a well-known American journalist, has well said, in a recent newspaper comment, that " with all our triumphs of mechanism, the human mind is still the greatest wonder of all."

This bears upon education in all its forms. The moral powers of personality are even more essential than the intellectual. What we need to-day, it seems to me, is not so much the intelligence test—although this has its proved place and value—as a *character test,* leading to an earnest effort to supplement the moral deficiencies which keep our boys and girls from becoming true men and women. Unless the moral powers are developed alongside the intellectual the latter may work fearful disaster.

(2) The possibilities of personality are greater even than its present powers. The undeveloped possibilities of human intercourse are boundless. If we should only undertake to develop these as we develop land and water and metals and oil and other natural resources, the enrichment would be incalculable. What hidden grace and strength and personal resources lie dormant in every individual! If they were only brought out the sand-strewn deserts of daily life would blossom as the rose. What would not human society become if every human being became all that he might be!

Instead of this, we constantly impoverish life by inconsiderate competitions, rivalries, distractions, depreciations. Our habits of shoving one another aside, treating others as things not as persons, makes life hardly better than an animal corral. This is the tragedy of depersonalizing life. We put before our children and young people the ideal of a successful vocation, in which they will be able to make money and secure a place in " good "—which generally means self-satisfied—society. Vocational choice and training is important; but the real issue is what one can do, not *in* his vocation but *through* his vocation, and beyond it, for the good of himself and his fellows—

how can he enrich and ennoble life for himself and others, how can he become his best self and help others to do the same.

By what motives and measures can the wondrously fine possibilities of personal relationships be realized? Take, for instance, the problem of the sex relations, always urgent and recently forced upon the public by the discussion of companionate marriage—a delusive phrase, as if husbands and wives had never been true companions, or as if they could be good companions under the scheme of " Oh, here comes someone I like the looks of! Good-bye, Mary! See if you can't find someone you like better than me! ". It looks as if merry days were ahead for our young folk—merry for a little, and then unutterably dreary and despairing, as the home breaks up and goes down stream in the flood of lost ideals. Or, can the home be kept intact? If Christianity survives, the *home* will—in which case companionate marriage will go down in the flood, with all other flimsy structures, instead of the home. We shall not solve this problem of sex relationship—indeed we shall get further and deeper into the murk and mire—until we solve it in the light of *the sacredness of sex as related to personality*. Here, in fact, is the key to most of our problems—*a higher evolution of personality*.

John Wright Buckham.

ON LIFE AND BOOKS.

THE OTHER HALF.

I HAVE just laid down an extremely interesting survey of the works of John Galsworthy (*John Galsworthy*. By Leon Schalit. Heinemann, 10s. 6d.). It is valuable, not merely as a very successful attempt by a German to appreciate a writer who is English through and through, but also in that it brings together in brief compass all the novels and plays, and enables us to get the cumulative effect of one whose output is larger than perhaps is commonly realized.

The impression left on me by a perusal of this book is mainly of those contrasts in English society which Galsworthy so vividly and yet so meticulously portrays. "The miserable inequality of things" has bitten deep into Galsworthy's soul, and it stares and glares at you from novels and plays alike. Justice is one thing for the rich and another for the poor. Over against the men of property, the Forsytes, the comfortable, are the weak, the caged, the continually anxious. We see the contrasts between the Barthwicks and the Joneses in *The Silver Box*: or we have Soames with his assured income and his pictures, and the consumptive workman drawing near to death, no longer able to support his wife and child, one of the many thousands " on whose shoulders sits the grinning cat of mortal illness." We have those for whom life means wealth and all that wealth can bring: we have the young flower-seller in *The Pigeon* who, wanted by nobody, tries to end her life in the river and is charged with attempted suicide: " Well, God in Heaven—of all the d——d topsy-turvy—not a soul in the world wants her alive—and now she's to be prosecuted for trying to be where everyone wants her."

Contrasts! Black—white! Rich—poor! Security—uncertainty!

* * * *

Yesterday morning I woke at five o'clock to the sound of heavenly music. All the birds in Epping Forest seemed to have gathered near to greet the dawn and to herald the spring. I listened entranced, for such a choir no human conductor ever gathered, no building made by mortal hands ever housed. For but a few moments it lasted, but it left me with a heart warmed within me and a soul a-thrill while yet I lay in my comfortable bed. After breakfast came a morning with my books, quick eyes that as yet need no aid enabling me to read rapidly and with pleasure. After lunch came a walk across the Forest, with eyes and ears alert to great Nature's spring-time sights and sounds. And then came the first cricket match of the season. It was cold, too cold to be ideal, but there was all the zest of the game, with its conflict of brain and muscle—filling the mind to the brim and driving away for the time all worry and all care. Then, despite the weariness that follows the first match, there was strength for a vigorous walk home; the evening meal; another hour or two with my books; and then the balm and comfort of a hot bath before bed. And now, after a night's rest, I am beginning another day with congenial work awaiting me, with many friends to see, with people to meet whose eyes will shine their message of welcome and affection.

* * * *

But the contrasts! The other half!

With X I have played many a game in the days of long ago, and never did a man play with more vim than he. But now, though he is but my

age, ten yards up the slightest slope exhausts him, and he cannot speak except in a whisper.

With Y I have spent hundreds of hours : many a time and oft have we played together or sat and watched Hirst drop on one knee and bang the ball round to the leg boundary. But Y will look on the eleven players flitting across the sward no more, their shadows lengthening as the day declines ; neither the ball, nor the bird in its flight, neither the flowers in spring-time, nor the starry sky at midnight, will he see again, for on him the thick darkness that only the blind can know has fallen.

Z would have loved to hear the anthem of the birds : it would have thrilled her very soul. But Z can hear no music. For twenty years she has faithfully worshipped with her folk and heard not a word from the preacher, not a note from the organ.

* * * *

And as some who once worked and played with me have no longer health and strength, so some have no leisure. Life has dealt hardly with them. Their work is uncongenial and they have to plod away, often when entirely unfit, for the sake of those dear to them. They have no time for recreation, even if they had strength and inclination for it. They are too tired to read even if they had the wherewithal to obtain books : their homes are drab, squalid, over-crowded. They have no reserve of strength and no reserve of resources. Anxiety about the morrow, fear what will happen if health fails, has sapped all their vitality. Life has for them little joy and no rapture.

* * * *

When I think of myself and my own lot—of all my joys and comforts, of my health and strength, my work and leisure, my home and security, I cannot but think of the contrasts, the other half. I am writing, I suppose, for those who are more or less in the same position as myself. May I flash on the screen some pictures of the other half? The first is from Kingsley Hall, Bow, where Muriel Lester and her helpers are living and working in the spirit of Christ Himself. The rest are from my own work.

" Downstairs in the basement live Mr. and Mrs. H. and their three children. Rats come in freely and stare balefully at them as they sit by the fire in the evening. Mrs. H. is very nervous when her husband is out, and has discovered that if the children are laughing and playing about the rats never venture in, so the children are kept up until ten o'clock every night to keep the rats away. If they grow sleepy and quiet, she rouses them : ' Come along, nah, don't yer want a game? Make a bit more noise, can't yer? ' ".

Here is an old woman of 81. She is sitting on the floor surrounded by boxes of every colour, which she is making with deft hands. " Ain't them colours lovely? ", she says, and when you answer that she shouldn't be working at that age, she replies, " Well, it do pass the time, and brings in a bit for some coal." She has to fetch the material, fold and gum the boxes, providing her own paste, hemp, light and warmth, and then carry the bundles back, receiving 6¾d. a gross. She never grumbles if she can get work to do, and was very indignant the other day when, having caught a cold fetching her boxes, she had to see a doctor, the first time for sixteen years.

Or there is A, a man still young, whose constitution was destroyed by the war. He has five young children, and the pension is not enough to keep them all. He can never go out and is often in pain, but he keeps

wonderfully brave and cheerful. His wife, brave soul, is often up at five in the morning, making boxes, too, to earn a little for the children.

Not far away is another old lady—income : Old Age Pension 10s., from her church 3s. The rent of her room is 9s., and on the other 4s. she has to live and keep warm for a week. Think of that, you other half, when your lunch costs you 4s. or you pay 8s. 6d. for a theatre ticket! When I think of some family budgets I know, and of the way some of us spend our money, I cannot wonder the angels weep.

* * * *

This article is often about books. But we who love books must not overlook life. Life's contrasts must always be before us, and we must always see the other half. We must never rest until these contrasts are removed, until the terrific inequalities, injustices, handicaps, have been swept away. The other day I listened to children and young folks at a Sunday School Anniversary singing lustily :—

This, our world, is God's world,
Wonderfully fair ;
With His power and glory
Present ev'rywhere.

And to me it seemed blasphemy. It seemed to contain so much falsehood. Present everywhere? Where I have seen little children dying because they have never had a chance to get decent food or air? Where I have watched a girl fighting for breath who could have been sturdy and strong had she had a home to live in instead of a hovel? Wonderfully fair? In those hospital wards through which I walked the other day with women in the grip of cancer, or in those in which I walked a few years ago where men's bodies had been mangled and torn by shells and their minds mangled and torn by indescribable sights and shocks? No, we must neither put the responsibility for the contrasts on God, nor must we be callous in our comfort, living with blinds down, refusing to face grim and brutal facts. We must look on the other half, ugly and disturbing as it is, and we must live with sympathy and understanding.

* * * *

I began with Galsworthy. I end with him, for the words he puts into the mouth of one of his characters go to the root of things : " If I had one prayer to make, Monsieur, it would be, ' Good God, give me to understand.' "

Albert Peel.

FOREIGN REVIEWS.

THE TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT: RECENT GERMAN LITERATURE NUMBER, APRIL 18TH, 1929.

IT would be most natural, in drawing attention to some of the more interesting points in this invaluable symposium on Post-War Germany, to begin with the article headed "The New Theologians." But this, excellent in many ways, and on the whole very well informed and fair minded, suffers from a lack of objective sympathy, as also from, it would seem, a lack of personal acquaintance with the writers and thinkers mentioned. It suffers, too, from the quite obvious strong prepossessions of its plainly Anglican author (at whose name it would not be difficult to make a good guess). This writer is very likely correct in his judgment that the school of liberal Protestantism represented by that brilliant star, Adolf von Harnack, has done its best work. But he need not anticipate its funeral so blatantly. It is certain that the great *Dogmengeschichte* will remain a landmark of objective exposition, a rock which will break many waves of supernaturalist froth yet.

To dismiss Troeltsch in a sentence as one of "others"—albeit "giants"—who "are felt to belong to the past," whilst devoting many inches of print to Otto and to Barth, certainly proves that our writer has a very canny journalistic *flair* for the popular! But Troeltsch has evidently committed the unforgivable sin of impugning some of the author's pet theological beliefs—so, or perhaps because he is difficult and our writer has only learnt about him at second hand, one of the most amazingly fresh and illuminating of German theological historians is merely mentioned as a burnt-out 19th century rocket. Yet he lived more than a third of his life—the most productive period—in the 20th century. There are no human touches, or very few. Troeltsch starved himself to death in trying to feed a number of his famishing neighbours from his slender professorial salary—one of the most splendid Christian witnesses was his. And Schweitzer's missionary enthusiasm is simply ignored, whilst his critical views are accorded far less consideration than they deserve—evidently he too is in our author's black book, having denied what that author is determined to believe. He seems to be even more annoyed with the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule,* with which he closely associates that lovable Christian, Johannes Weiss. He quotes, as it seems clear, with disapproval, the conclusion of this school and of the allied *formgeschichtliche Schule,* that "the Gospels are not simple history books: they are confessions of faith. It is as an object of faith and of 'cult' (*i.e.*, of religious devotion) that they bring Jesus before us." We should have imagined that this conclusion was so obvious as hardly to require statement. Again, of the endearing personalities of Heiler and Otto we are denied even a glimpse, whilst the work done by the former as a student of Sanskrit and of Indian faiths is left out altogether. Of course, if the excellent *Times* will persist in drawing its theological contributors solely from that particular group of Christians which is most firmly dogmatic and nationalist, and in which students of German are not too common, and dislike of Germany is still common, well, then, its comments will continue to be the result of mere book reading and not of personal contact.

What is even more noticeable than the selective bias of this writer as regards the scholars mentioned, more evident even than his own strong

prejudices, is his omission of whole tracts of theological interest and learning from his survey. The *O.T.* is not even mentioned, nor is Church History. Comparative Religion, as apart from *N.T.* discussions, is cold shouldered, and dogmatic theology becomes little more than ancillary to *N.T.* studies, whilst historical theology is a blank. Perhaps these very omissions indicate correct perspective—though they undoubtedly also point to the limits of the writer's own knowledge. Still it is quite true that since the war German theology has been occupied very extensively with the age-old problem of defining the exact relation of the historic Jesus to the faith of groups, and, especially, of individuals (though in this regard the work of Troeltsch is so significant that we do not know whether to attribute its non-mention to ignorance or to direct antipathy). German theological writers and students are feeling the need of assimilating their work to the spirit of revolt from purely logical intellectualism and from the authority assumed by the teachers of a State Church based on the dogmas of such an intellectualism.

It is at this point that the connexion between theological thought and the general mentality as expressed along other lines becomes so particularly striking. Theology is, of course, never existent *in vacuo*. Religious thought is always sensitive to the general movement of the human mind in any group at any period—more sensitive and more easily coloured by its environment just because it represents the faith of relatively ordinary people who are not muffled intellectually against the influence of atmospheric shifts of emphasis in the general life around them. For as religion is something that has to be lived out from day to day amidst changing conditions, so it must ever anxiously seek to adapt its intellectual framework so as to respond to altered stresses and strains.

Thus the tendencies in education, theoretic and practical economics, the presentation of history, the emphases popular in philosophy, and in those two dominating influences of modern life, the novel and the drama—all of these are but symptoms of the general mentality (on which, however, they react fatefully and furiously) and by these same influences religious thought is profoundly affected.

The article on " Recent Philosophy," therefore, is significant for us. Happily, notwithstanding its fearsomely technical appearance and immense erudition, the dragon is really a simple old dear, in spite of the red fire of technical terms which he spits from his mouth. In a word, Germany has been converted from neo-Kantianism to phenomenology, and, despoiled of the frills and trimmings which represent individual stresses and preferences, this change is really the same as the theological swing to the *crisis* faith of the Barthians, or the change in art typified by expressionism. Phenomenology is defined as a sort of half-way house between the extreme objectivism of Mill and the equally extreme subjectivism of Hume, but, of course, with a twentieth century setting. The transcendental categorical values of Kant are definitely rejected—we are to trust intellect as far as our practical grasp of life is concerned. But the Gilbertian criticism of 19th century Kantianism so delicately stippled in the irony of

Duty, duty—must be done,

is accepted. In this important *volte-face* we can easily trace the reaction of religious pragmatism (and of psychology), as also of the rationalizing movements in industry, on philosophy itself. The " high priori road " had led to Spandau, and Kant-cum-Hegel had been so interpreted as to result in the Treitschkeian theory of the State. The new phenomenology represents a more modest, and therefore more hopeful, attempt to tackle things as they are, regarding intellect as sufficient rather than all-sufficient,

and thus leaving room for due stress on the importance of emotion, and of instinctive, or rather of hereditary and inbred, motives and tendencies. The purely spiritual being of the Kantians has long been dissolving under the weight of accumulating evidence, largely anthropological and psychological, to the contrary. And the same direction is being given to education, swinging back from the cool reliance on intellect of Herbart to the sit-at-the-feet-of-the-child attitude of Pestalozzi (though Germany has a long way to go yet in this direction—the absolute belief in intellectual training of young Germans who are evidently thoroughly representative is appalling to even a relatively conservative Englishman).

In short, all these articles hang together. They must be read not as separate discussions of distinct isolated fields, but as a totality giving a fairly complete view of a whole. The Youth Movement, *e.g.*, which began with the *Wandervogel* just before the war, has been responsible directly and indirectly for the various experiments on lines of self-government in schools. Xenophon tells us that the soldiers feared Clearchos, that stern-faced, harsh-voiced, martinet, " as boys regard their schoolmaster." And Prussianism in the school often resulted in the boy's feeling toward his teacher tending to become that of a private toward his officer. Added to this was the terrible examination system which, with its plan of *Berechtigungen* and the *einjärige* scheme of partial exemption from military service, often determined or damned a boy's prospects for life during his schooldays and so clutched the whole youth of a nation in the steel grip of a wicked intellectualized discipline imposed from above.

Thus in philosophy and in education, as in theology, release is the keynote, release from the iron hardness of an impersonal arbitrary standard imposed on the individual without his consent—without even the pretence of consultation with him. The discussion in " Education since the War " of the changes in curriculum is equally significant. The place given to history, and the spirit in which it is taught; the value attached to modern language teaching, and the choice of languages for this purpose; the struggle between the old ideals of the classical, now called the humanistic, *Gymnasium,* and the mathematical and natural science *Gymnasium,* with geography as a link—especially notable is this last point; and finally the signs that something like the English games system may yet, *mutatis mutandis,* take root in German schools. At present German athletics are still cultivated too much with the foot-rule. The easy English joy in the game for itself—the carelessness of measured results, is too much lacking. The stern Spartan idea is too much in evidence. Sometimes it has been thought that Germany may yet be saved from Prussianism, as Spain may be from bull-fighting, by lawn tennis and football—both now enormously popular in these countries.

It is curious to turn to the sections on " Social Economics " and to see how there too the practical realism of phenomenology, which is reflected in the Barthian effort to attain definite touch with reality and effective conversion and consecration, works out in the fields of manufacture and commerce. Here, of course, as everywhere, America is the stimulus and the model. The *band* system of continuous manufacture, known to us in the factories of Ford and Morris, is the practical ideal in industry. Production and ever more production is the immediate necessity to which all theorists are bending their views, even the erstwhile extreme Marxians. What the future will be, that arouses intense interest and lively discussion. Sombart supposes that the Eastern countries and Africa, as they adopt industrialism, and so cease to be the consumers of European and American manufactured goods, will so react as to force European countries back to

fundamental production, slowing up and transforming the present flowing stream of mechanized manipulative manufacture. The immediate point is that economic theory and practice are agreed for the present about the need for production, the application of man's mental powers to the direct problems of engineering, finance, transport, agriculture, and mining rather than to more abstract and (possibly) ultimately fundamental questions regarding the true nature of labour's relation to capital. Intellect is to be turned on to the solution of Madame How's questions rather than those of Lady Why, and the tyranny of imposed theories, either of the Marxian or anti-Marxian, is relegated to limbo during the present distress. An economics of crisis[1], too, perhaps of release also. We shall see.

J. P. Naish.

Die vorchristliche und frühchristliche Zeit des Paulus. By Dr. Ernst Barnikol. Mühlau. M.3,50.

This brochure by Prof. Barnikol of Kiel is an elaborate discussion of Paul's early history based on the difficult and much disputed passage in *Gal.* $1^{10\text{-}24}$. Prof. Barnikol seeks to prove that not Tarsus but Damascus was the place where Paul's pre-Christian thought was chiefly formed. He produces interesting arguments to show that Damascus was counted as belonging to Arabia, so that *Gal.* 1^{17b} should be translated, "I went to Arabia and returned again to Damascus," as one who had lived in London might say, "I went to England, returning again to London." Prof. Barnikol, deducing from Paul's statements that the sphere of his first missionary activity was the sphere where formerly he had persecuted, finds the sphere of his persecutions not in Jerusalem but in the North of Galilee, and in this way avoids the difficulty of explaining how one who had been a persecutor of the Jerusalem Church should be unknown to the Christians there. It is impossible to discuss adequately in a brief review a book so highly technical as this. It is one with which scholars will have to reckon. We look forward with interest to the two succeeding volumes on the early history of Christianity which Prof. Barnikol plans to write.

Sydney Cave.

The Christian Faith. By F. Schleiermacher. English translation, edited by Mackintosh and Stewart. Clark. 21s.

An English translation of Schleiermacher's great work, *Der Christliche Glaube,* has long been a felt want among theologians. It has now been supplied by a group of scholars working under the general direction of Professor H. R. Mackintosh, of Edinburgh, and to all of them a deep debt of gratitude is due. As might be expected, the translation is exceedingly well done, and in spite of the many obscurities of Schleiermacher's style and thought, the English reader is left in no doubt as to his meaning and can quite easily follow his line of argument. In spite of the reaction against Schleiermacher which is now going on in certain circles in Germany, his work still remains the fount and source of all that is best in modern Protestant theology. There could be no better discipline for the theological student to-day than to read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest the substance of this great book. He may often find its form rather strange and perhaps repellent, and he will discover many things in it with which he cannot agree and from which Christian thought has moved away.

1 We use the word here in its ordinary English sense, being of course aware of the peculiar technical meaning attached to it by the Barthian theologians in their *Krisistheologie.*

But none the less he cannot fail to profit by intercourse with so deep a thinker and by putting himself alongside so genuinely Christian an experience. With all his apparent pedantry Schleiermacher is intensely human in his handling of the great Christian verities, and a man who is in earnest could have no better guide to the central citadel of the Christian faith. This is not the time or place for reviewing or criticizing Schleiermacher's theology. His main positions are now well known and both their strength and weakness fairly well understood. As some knowledge of him is essential to any understanding of nineteenth century theology, it is a matter for great thankfulness that his work should be within reach of all, and it is to be hoped that it will be very widely read.

W. B. Selbie.

Hegel. Science of Logic. Allen & Unwin. 2 vols. 32s.

It is strange that the " corner-stone of the Hegelian system "—Hegel's *Wissenschaft der Logik,* the first part of which was published in 1812 and the last in 1816—should never have been published in an English version until this year. Doubtless the student may be supposed to go to the original text; but if he be of that kind which has to examine a dozen or more pages of the dictionary to every one of the text, it may be questioned whether the profit gained from his researches would be in any measure proportionate to the time and labour expended. To attempt to read Hegel with a dictionary would be like trying to climb Snowdon in splints. On the whole it is better to have reached the summit by the funicular railway than never to have reached the summit at all. Not, indeed, that there are " corner seats " even for those travellers up the steep slopes of the *Wissenschaft der Logik* who have the benefit of this admirable translation by Messrs. W. H. Johnston and L. G. Struthers. If there were it would not be a good translation. Hegel did not try to write popularly. Sometimes, indeed, the translators are moved to think his roughness and obscurity are the product of no other motive than " sheer devilry." They have done their best for us, however, and English students of philosophy are laid under a large obligation to them.

A short time ago the criticism might have been levelled against a translation such as this that, though praiseworthy, it was of little importance. Why waste time with Hegel, the last of the rash system-builders with his inadequate science and all? That is a question not so likely to be asked to-day. The cry—and it is an excellent cry—has been " back to Kant," but we are learning that " back to Kant " means also to the wise man " forward again through Hegel." " It is not too much to say," writes the late Lord Haldane in his Introductory Preface to the present work, " that no student of philosophy can be sure of the ground he is treading unless he has made the effort required to follow out what Hegel claims to tell him."

The translators provide a valuable glossary (German-English and English-German) of " some principal recurrent equivalents " used in their translation.

E. R. Micklem.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

" Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

" A good book is the precious life-blood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(The place of publication is London, and the date 1928 *or* 1929 *unless otherwise stated.)*

The Present Crisis in Religion. By W. E. ORCHARD, D.D. Cassell. 6s.

All that Dr. Orchard writes deserves careful thought, and this book is no exception, much as it will arouse disagreement in places. Dr. Orchard paints the situation to-day in terribly dark colours. He never seems quite clear what he means by " Catholicism," is often hard put to it to defend Roman Catholic practices, *e.g.*, Mariolatry, and occasionally (as on p. 161) his argument seems to make violent leaps. But he has much to say that must be acted upon if the Church is to give effective witness for Christ to the world. Not least is he right in his criticism of the Protestant Churches for their abandonment of apologetic.

The future of Christianity he seems to envisage as follows :—

> If the existing Protestant Churches could develop along the lines of their present tendency, and become societies, brotherhoods or orders within the one Church, for attacking the degraded, the unbelieving, the indifferent or the idealistic, and when they had done their best for them, would pass them on to be instructed in the complete doctrinal system of the Church, and to be prepared to take effective part in its supreme sacramental mysteries, we can conceive how a place could be found for such institutions as the Salvation Army or the Methodist Missions for reaching " the down and outs " ; the Churches which concern themselves less with definite doctrines, such as the Congregationalists, or even the Unitarians, could specialize in presenting a reasoned apologetic for the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, and the ethical teaching of Christ; and any such bodies as the Society of Friends could exist to emphasize the social and pacific implications of Christianity, and to provide free forms of fellowship and silent forms of worship for those who could easiest begin with them.
>
> The leaders and accredited teachers of all such bodies would, of course, accept the full Catholic faith and loyally seek to introduce those whom they influenced, whenever they were ready for them, to the higher doctrines and more specific forms of Christianity. The bodies which now generally call themselves Catholic could provide both the doctrinal instruction and the sacramental worship. The whole might be governed by a constitutional and benevolent papacy, now, however, no longer using the one-time methods of excommunication and persecution, but nevertheless, after due consultation with representatives and authorities, declaring what the Christian faith is and what practices are necessary to a full Christian life; but perhaps leaving any attempt to define, who did or who did not belong to the Church. The accredited rulers, teachers and workers would be registered and commissioned, but access to all the sacraments would be left open to all others, rightly prepared, and who had sufficiently confessed their faith.

We can only say that it is extremely kind of Dr. Orchard to remain a minister in so primitive and rudimentary a society as a Congregational Church : or is it that those who " accept the full Catholic faith " decline to accept him as one of their ministers, and the only people who will give

him a home are crude and elementary folk like the Congregationalists? We do recognize, however, that Dr. Orchard is extremely good at "passing them on"! But perhaps one day Dr. Orchard will be the Benevolent Pope, so we had better be careful. EDITOR.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John. By the Most Rev. and Right Honourable J. H. BERNARD, D.D., edited by the Rev. A. H. MCNEILE, D.D. Clark. 2 vols. 15s. each.

The appearance of the *I.C.C.* on the Fourth Gospel is an event anxiously awaited for many years. It was a relief to know that on the lamented death of Archbishop Bernard two years ago the MS. was left complete. The labours of the editor have been confined to seeing the work through the Press. We now have in our hands the first full-sized English commentary on this Gospel since Westcott's appeared in 1908, and as that seems to have been substantially completed before 1887, it is full forty years since English scholarship tackled on an adequate scale the most difficult critical and exegetical task which the *N.T.* student can undertake. It may be said at once that the new commentary has no cause to fear comparison with its predecessor as a learned, sober, and devout treatment of its great theme. There are, indeed, some minor blemishes, not surprising in a work carried on through many years which did not receive the final touches of all from its author's hand, but taken as a whole the commentary is a monument of careful and thorough scholarship along its own lines, and within limitations to which we shall call attention.

The forty years since Westcott have been marked by intense activity over the whole field of New Testament studies, and during a large part of the period the Fourth Gospel has been much in the foreground of discussion. It is interesting to enquire what progress is registered in the present commentary as compared with its predecessor.

First, textual criticism has been advanced in the interval by the discovery of new MSS. and by vastly more thorough study of the ancient versions. The changes which have in consequence been made here in Westcott and Hort's text are perhaps not so extensive as might have been expected—or as they may yet have to be when some new lines in the textual criticism of the Gospels have been more fully worked out. But Dr. Bernard has been able to introduce into his text some interesting new readings. Thus in 11^{42} he removes from the text a statement which, put into the mouth of Jesus, must have been a stumbling-block to many, and reads, with the recently discovered Koridethi MS. (Θ) "for the sake of the crowd standing by I do it."

Secondly, linguistic study has made great advances, both in the field of Greek and in the field of Semitic speech which in one way or another lies behind the *N.T.* writings. The new study of Hellenistic Greek has delivered *N.T.* scholars from the classical obsession which was the bane of the Westcott school (and diminished the value of the *R.V.*). The new commentary is in general sound in this matter, and it is interesting to note that Dr. Bernard rightly adduces the usage of the *Koiné* to explain many locutions which have been claimed as Semitisms. Once again we have a competent Semitist refusing to accept Burney's alluring theory of an Aramaic original, while he accepts, as do most scholars, the evidence for Aramaic thinking somewhere behind the Gospel.

Of even greater importance are the new departures in "higher criticism." In Westcott's time it was an axiom, with conservative and radical critics alike, that the Gospel was a "seamless robe," the work all through of a single mind, transmitted to us in the form (apart from merely

textual variations) in which it was composed. Serious inroads have been made upon this theory from all sides. It has come to be widely held that many of the difficulties of the Gospel may be due to accidental displacements since the work was completed. Dr. Bernard was so persuaded of this that he has actually printed the text in a " restored " order, in which, for example, c. 6 precedes c. 5, and the sections of c. 7 are given a different sequence. Such " restorations " of order do certainly cause the work to read more smoothly in some respects. The only question is whether a more thoroughgoing criticism might not be forced to admit that the confusion of order goes deeper than a mere displacement of the sheets of a completed work, and belongs partly at least to the process of composition from sources. That such a process has indeed taken place Dr. Bernard allows, for he abandons the traditional theory that the Gospel was written out of his own memories by John son of Zebedee, and attributes it to " John the Presbyter," supposed to be the author of the Johannine epistles, a writer dependent upon others for most of his material. Thus the Prologue is held to be based on a Hymn of the Logos, into which the evangelist has interpolated comments of his own. For most of the Gospel, however, he is held to be directly dependent on the reminiscences of John son of Zebedee, who is identified with the Beloved Disciple. This identification is, on internal evidence, precarious. The non-synoptic material in the Gospel is not for the most part of a kind which suggests any derivation from the Galilean group. But it is a piece of very ancient tradition. Dr. Bernard, indeed, thinks he can show that his theory of duplicate authorship is not inconsistent with statements made by early writers. This is no doubt comforting to those who would feel uneasy about rejecting primitive tradition, while their critical conscience forbids them to believe that such a work as this was actually produced by one of the Twelve. To others it will hardly carry conviction. Actually, the adoption of such a theory by so cautious a scholar may well be taken as marking the definite victory of criticism over tradition in one of its most strongly entrenched positions, and it is not likely that a permanent halt will be made at the point where Dr. Bernard takes his stand.

When we turn from the introduction to the commentary itself, we find that the concession to criticism is almost illusory, for John son of Zebedee, is still made responsible for the narrative and for the substance of the discourses to so large an extent that the strict historicity of the record is hardly affected by the intervention of the evangelist. The adoption of this particular theory of authorship therefore does not mitigate the difficulties raised by conflict on matters of fact between John and the Synoptics. As usually happens, insistence on the historical value of the Fourth Gospel tends to a depreciation of the Synoptics (which can only end in a far-reaching distrust of all our sources). Some of the cases in which Johannine evidence is preferred are strange enough. Thus the Johannine account of the " descent of the Spirit " upon Jesus is taken to represent the plain fact that a pigeon was observed to alight upon His head, and this is preferred to the more mystical suggestion of the Marcan narrative. The same rather naive rationalism appears in other interpretations offered by Dr. Bernard. Thus in the story of the Marriage at Cana, while very properly concluding that " it is impossible now to discern exactly what took place," he suggests that " the belief of the ἀρχιτρίκλινος that he had been drinking wine, when he had only been drinking water, may have been due to the magnetic and compelling force of the words of Jesus." No doubt, if you feel obliged to suppose that such stories are guaranteed by the authority of an eye witness, then some such interpretation may

provide first aid to the incredulous. But is it not really more consonant with the religious intention of the Gospel to suppose that if Jesus did not conjure water into wine neither did He hypnotize people into thinking He had done so; but that He did, and does, offer the rich wine of a satisfying communion with God in place of thin and tasteless substitutes? This, however, involves allegory, and Dr. Bernard will not have it that the evangelist is an allegorist. He does right, no doubt, to reject many of the more fanciful allegorical interpretations of ancient and modern commentators, but in insisting on a bald literalism he surely raises a barrier against the true understanding of a writer who, on any showing, well understood the value of symbolism. Similarly, the attempt to fit as much as possible of the discourses by hook or by crook into the historical conditions of the ministry of Jesus, while admitting the necessity of attributing portions of them to the reflexions of the evangelist, tends to hinder the full appreciation of them as the expression of a consistent and massive theology in which history and experience are fused. When once complete unity of authorship has been abandoned, we are drawn on to a more thoroughgoing analysis of the Gospel, which may well result in doing fuller justice both to its historical and to its theological elements.

The most serious limitation of the commentary, however, is its almost total neglect of the Hellenistic background. A comparison of these volumes with the new edition of Walter Bauer's commentary, for example, astonishes the reader by the contrast between the amount of illustrative material deemed necessary to an understanding of the Gospel by a German and by an English commentator. The Mandaean and Hermetic literatures are dismissed with casual mention, and all the evidence, rich if perplexing, about contemporary syncretistic religious thought—Christian, Jewish, and pagan—is almost ignored, except where it is found in Philo. It is not enough to dismiss contemptuously (*cf.* p. 356) the suggestion that the evangelist drew upon such material as a source. The contempt may be justified. But his public stood in the full stream of syncretistic thought, and the resemblances, even if they be thought superficial, could not be missed by the contemporary reader. The task of an interpreter of the Gospel is not achieved until he has defined in some way its relation to a widespread religious movement in which Jewish and pagan elements were already interfused, and which very quickly became aware of Christianity. Its relation to normal rabbinic Judaism is fairly adequately, and fruitfully, treated in this commentary, but that is certainly not enough. We are in this matter still in an early stage of the investigation, but to those who are working in the field it already becomes clear that we may hope for a new understanding of this Gospel which will set it more firmly than ever on its pinnacle of greatness as a religious document.

The commentary, then, is in many respects a fine piece of work, to which the English student will constantly turn with gratitude, but—we still want a good modern commentary on the Gospel according to John.

C. H. Dodd.

The Christ of Apostolic Faith. By H. T. Andrews, D.D. With a Memoir of the Author by Jessie Forsyth Andrews, M.A. Nisbet. 5s.

The reading of this posthumous volume deepens the sense of the loss which Christian theology has suffered in the death of the author before he was able to carry out the plans of literary work he had formed. This volume is itself only part of a larger work, but what is here offered is in itself complete enough to justify the publication, and affords a valuable

contribution, not to theology only, but also to religion. Had the author been able to carry out his plan, and show what Christ has been in Christian experience throughout the centuries, what treasures of thought and life would have been gathered for us! The portion of his task which he was able to accomplish may, however, be regarded as the most important, as it deals with the classic literature of the Christian Church, the *N.T.* The treatment of the subject shows all the qualities which entitled the author to a place in the front rank of *N.T.* scholars and Christian theologians. Extensive and accurate learning, balanced judgment, spiritual discernment, are here at the command of an assured and enlightened faith; and the volume is fitted to serve to illumine and sustain the faith of others. The brief Memoir, written by his wife, shows remarkable reserve and objectivity; it presents the man just as he was to those who knew him, loved him, and had the privilege of working with him. It is forty years since I first knew him as a fellow-student in Oxford; for a quarter of a century we were in close and intimate association in our common task. I can testify that this Memoir is indeed an authentic portrait.

The contents of the book are of too great value to be dismissed with a short general notice, and demand a more detailed discussion. Despite the depreciation of Schleiermacher in some recent theological writings, this volume is written from his standpoint. The dogmatic and the speculative treatments are set aside in favour of the psychological, or the standpoint of experience. Dealing with the two sets of facts—the historical, consisting of events, and the more purely psychological, concerned with experiences—the author distinguishes the fact itself from its explanation and its interpretation, and recognizes that these two need always a critical judgment in the light of modern knowledge.

> "The criteria, therefore," he writes, "which we shall be justified in using to test the validity of religious experience are: (1) What is the ethical effect which flows from it? (2) How far is the individual experience confirmed by the common experience of the Christian? (3) How far does the experience conform to what Jesus Himself led us to expect? (4) How far has the experience anything that answers to it in the consciousness of Jesus Himself? This last criterion, for reasons which have already been stated, cannot apply to the whole range of Christian experience, but is necessarily limited to a section of it."

The qualification in the last sentence refers to the moral and religious uniqueness of Jesus.

Of the Christian experience the author holds the primary source is the *N.T.*, and with this subsequent chapters deal. Confining himself to the Synoptic record he next seeks to show how Jesus appeared to His contemporaries. He insists on the objectivity of the presentation by the evangelists.

> "Their self-restraint is beyond all praise. It cannot be said that in the narratives they interpret Jesus as Paul interpreted Him. Their keen sense of historical fact seems to have kept their theological predilections in complete abeyance."

The verdict of the common people, the opponents, and the disciples is examined.

> "It was the cumulative effect of all these causes—the moral authority displayed by Jesus, to begin with, then the saintliness of His character, then His heroic fortitude in the face of danger, then His miracles and the high services He rendered to mankind in His redemptive activity, and last of all His unique God-consciousness—it was the cumulative effect of all these in combination, that raised in the minds of the contemporaries of Jesus the problem of the interpretation of His person."

"The verdict of the opponents of Jesus unwittingly verifies the impression which the evidence shows that He made upon the people."

The Confession of Peter

"means that the disciples had reached the conviction that only the highest term in the popular theological vocabulary of Judaism was sufficient to describe all that they saw in Jesus."

"The disciples accepted without question all that Jesus claimed for Himself."

Passing to the Faith of the Primitive Church, the author traces the path by which Christianity passed from the confession of Messiahship to the inclusion of Jesus by the side of God and the Holy Spirit in the Apostolic Benediction. The first step was the ascription of the title *Lord* to Christ:

"The proof that this word is primitive and originated within the circle of Jewish Christianity is to be found in the existence of the Aramaic phrase *Maranatha*, which, as we know from *I Cor.* 16^{23}, was one of the watch-words of the early Christian Church."

"The combination suggests that both terms ought to be construed in the highest sense."

From the speeches of Peter as recorded in *Acts* the conclusion is drawn that with the simple creed "Our Lord Jesus Christ" was combined a crude quasi-Adoptionist Christology. How in thirty years the rudimentary doctrine of the Trinity was reached is the problem. The explanation is not

"in the impact of Græco-Roman thought upon the Christian facts,"

for, then,

"Philo, and not Jesus, ought to have become the founder of the new religion."

"If we want to understand the development of theology in the Christian Church, it is to the Christ of experience we must look for its explanation and its cause."

The two facts on which this experience was based were the Resurrection of Christ and "the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost," and the two facts were inseparable; it was the Risen Lord who gave the Spirit. In Paul this experience finds its highest expression. A masterly analysis of that experience is then given. For Paul the moral problem was solved in the power which faith in Christ imparted.

"Jesus Christ had altered the balance of forces in the moral life and made virtue and goodness attainable in a way that had never been possible before."

But besides this there is the mystical element, "the communion with the living, eternal Christ."

"Paul in his mystical phraseology is referring to a very definite religious experience of the actual presence of the living and eternal Christ in his life."

No natural mystic tendency explains this; from his conversion onwards

"the eternal Christ was as great a reality to him as the historical Jesus had been to the first disciples."

He gave Christ the place of God in his mysticism because Christ had the value of God for him, not only in his religious communion, but in moral influence on his character. This individual mysticism has its confirmation in the communal mysticism in the life of the Church of Christ as His body. One cannot but regret that the author did not develop his view

"that this mystical sense of communion with Christ was fostered by the Christian Sacraments."

Rightly he insists that this mysticism is central, and that his doctrine of the atonement must be regarded from this standpoint. Bold but true are his words :

> " Apart from the reality of the mystical experience, Paulinism is a mere patchwork of Jewish pedantries and legalisms. It is only the reality of the experience that gives it an intelligible value and meaning, either for ancient or for modern thought."

Even if " the Benediction is adumbrated in the Book of Wisdom ", the place of Christ in it can be explained only by the fact of Christian experience. A characteristic feature of the treatment in this chapter is the author's insistence that we do not explain why certain terms or ideas were borrowed from contemporary thought in the interpretation of Jesus by showing their source; we must show what Jesus was to those who so interpreted Him.

Having shown how the confession of Messiahship became the Apostolic Benediction, the next chapter seeks

> " to trace the process by which the Benediction developed into the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel."

Denying that from the first Paul had a uniform and definite form of Christology, the author maintains that

> " the statements of Paul about Jesus are on the contrary so many *different experiments in Christology.*"

The only serious difference of judgment it is necessary to mention is where the author finds Paul's first attempt in

> " the philosophical conception of the ' heavenly ' or ' archetypal man ' in *I Cor.* 15^{47}."

He himself suggests a doubt whether this exegesis of the passage is correct; I feel certain that it is not, as the context needs no such explanation, the reference throughout being to the Risen Christ. Not only would this idea be inconsistent with the Logos doctrine, as he recognizes, but it would also be inconsistent with the doctrine of the Kenosis in *Phil.* 2, as he does not observe, since there the assumption of humanity is at the Incarnation. What is said of the Christology of *Col.* and *Phil.* calls for no special comment; the justification of that Christology is very successfully given in this sentence :

> " In the final issue moral reality and cosmic reality must originate in the same source and be two aspects of the same ultimate fact."

Attention may be called to the effective way in which the objection that such a deification of Christ can be explained by citing the attempt at deifying Apollonius of Tyana is met.

> " The Neoplatonists failed completely to convince that world that Apollonius was divine."

Why did Paul succeed? The difference lay in the personality of the hero. Once Christ was raised to the divine dignity as He is in *Col.*, the doctrine of Incarnation as Kenosis in *Phil.* became inevitable.

> " It is one of the great achievements of Paul that, out of his great experience of Christ he evolved a philosophy of the Christian religion which has been the centre of orthodox Christian doctrine ever since."

The Fourth Gospel is regarded as offering

> " the final stage in the development of New Testament Christology."

The author agrees with Harnack against other scholars that the Prologue is not the key to the discourses in the Gospel.

> " In the Prologue, Jesus is construed in terms of the Logos; in the rest of the Gospel He is construed in terms of sonship."

Accordingly,

> " the portrait which is drawn of Jesus in the Discourses of the Fourth Gospel is the portrait of the supreme mystic "

and of this representation the germ is found in *Matt.* 11^{27}, while the development in the Fourth Gospel is due to the mystical experience of the Christian Church.

> " The Mystical relation that existed between the Christian and his risen Lord suggested that a parallel—though far more perfect—relation of the same order existed between Christ and God."

This is a fresh thought, worth fuller consideration. I am glad to find that the author recognizes that there are in the Gospel passages which in thought belong to the Prologue, as I have tried to show in *The Beloved Disciple.* The Prologue he does not regard, however, as an incongruous foreign accretion to the Gospel.

> " The metaphysical interpretation of Jesus in the Prologue is based upon the mystical interpretation in the Discourses; and that in turn comes out of the mystical experience of the Church."

Attaching little importance to the question of the source from which this idea was derived, the author stresses the significant fact that the writer of the Prologue used it,

> " because it was the highest available philosophical category in existence at the time."

He recognizes, however, that this conception does not

> " provide us to-day with an adequate solution of the Christological problem."

I should venture to add that the subsequent development of Christology was not helped but hindered by the prominence and dominance of this idea; the idea of sonship is much to be preferred. The conclusion of the whole matter of the book is in the last sentence:

> " None but the highest terms and categories of thought are adequate for the true interpretation of Jesus Christ."

The special interest and importance of the book lies in this, that while using as a master the resources and the methods of modern Biblical scholarship, the author does not leave us with the negative conclusions about the person of Christ which many calling themselves modernists offer to us; but he can reaffirm the common enduring Christian faith. Is not the explanation that he himself had shared the mystical experiences of Paul:

> " I live, yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me? "

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

The Authority of Jesus and its Foundation; a study in the Four Gospels and the *Acts*. By BERTRAM LEE WOOLF, Ph.D., M.A., B.Sc., B.D. Allen & Unwin. 12s. 6d.

We cordially welcome this volume from the pen of the young Congregational scholar who has recently been appointed to the New Testament Chair in Hackney and New College. It more than justifies the wisdom of those who called him to this important post, and bids us expect from him work of a very high order.

Dr. Woolf enquires into the nature of the authority ascribed to Jesus by those who were brought into personal contact with Him in the days of His flesh, with a view to ascertaining the kind of authority which He rightly exercises in the lives of Christians to-day. The opening chapter on the conception of authority is somewhat difficult, but seems to suggest a

pragmatic view of authority as attaching to that which furthers life and its interests, *i.e.,* leads to the expansion of personality.

In Part I, which is Analytical, Dr. Woolf examines the Gospel records in detail and comes to the conclusion that, according to the oldest sources, Jesus did not claim, nor did His hearers ascribe to Him, authority of an official kind, *i.e.,* in virtue of His being the Son of God, the apocalyptic "Son of Man," the Messiah, the fulfilment of scriptural promises, or the worker of signs and wonders. The authority He exercises lies in Himself, in what He is and what He says. His words make their own impression upon His hearers, and win their immediate assent. They bring conviction by their own weight. He does not possess authority, *e.g.,* because He is Messiah; on the contrary Peter hails Him as Messiah because he has already experienced the authority of His words. The authority of Jesus is primarily that of a prophet.

The detailed discussion of the passages is not easy to follow. The reader needs a Greek Testament constantly at his elbow. Occasionally the treatment of important passages is brusque, and far too often the argument is closed with an *ipse dixit,* suggesting a kind of authority rather different from that which Dr. Woolf is describing. The style suggests a note-book rather than a formal treatise. The discussion of the use of the term "Son of Man" seems to be inadequate. Dr. Woolf contends that in our earliest records it has no technical use, but is simply equivalent to the personal pronoun: he does not, however, explain why it is that Jesus uses a periphrasis of this sort instead of the straightforward "I."

Part II is Constructive and well rewards the reader who has not been put off by the anatomical treatment of Part I. Dr. Woolf holds that the Living Christ of apostolic experience is identical with the historical Jesus and continues His authority. He speaks as directly to the minds and consciences of men as in the days of His flesh. His authority, therefore, rests not upon any metaphysical claims, but upon what He does for those who listen to Him. His divine Sonship means that He enjoys perfect communion with and complete comprehension of God, and therefore can speak to men with the authority of an expert. What is called sinlessness in Him is "the self-consistency of His person, and the harmony of His ideals with what human nature really needs in all its varying phases." His ethical intuitions are valid for all circumstances and for all times.

The doctrine of the divine Sonship, we are told, finds no direct support in the oldest records, but is the outgrowth of apostolic experience of the Living Christ. His uniqueness resides in the fact that whereas all men are sons of God *in posse,* He is the actual son κατ' ἐξοχήν It is as such that He speaks with the authority of God: "We worship Him as Son of God, as the Second Person in the Trinity, as the Saviour of Mankind, as the Sinless Perfect Divine man." But such worship or obedience, says Dr. Woolf, is to be distinguished from the personal authority of a living Lord in the experience of the believing soul. Jesus is more than a teacher. His authority finds its most active expression when His personality grips us, the same personality that we see in the Gospels. "Let him who can say this is other than the power and the presence of Deity." But surely we feel bound to ask why do we find the power and the presence of Deity in Christ? We are driven somewhere back upon metaphysics. Like Ritschl's, Dr. Woolf's view leaves us with no secure foundation for Christological categories. We hope that he will expound this side of his thinking in a subsequent volume.

We regret that so excellent a book should be disfigured by so many misprints and lapses in grammatical construction. It bears all the marks of having been unduly hurried through the press. This, however, does not conceal the fact that the careful study of many years has gone to its making. We wish both for the book and its author the success they richly deserve.

E. J. PRICE.

The Gospel and its Tributaries. By E. F. SCOTT, D.D. Clark. 10s.

It is now twenty years since Dr. Scott achieved distinction at one stroke by his memorable study, *The Fourth Gospel*. In the intervening years he has kept up a steady output and maintained his reputation for sound learning, clear thinking, and lucid expression. The present volume of Kerr Lectures is no exception to that rule. Its purpose is to show how "Christianity drew into itself many tributary elements and in so doing transformed them so that the result was not some nondescript composite religion, but a new and in some ways more adequate expression of the message of Jesus." Among those tributary elements are the Jewish inheritance (here Dr. Scott seems to us least successful; he lumps the prophets together, *e.g.*, not discerning that there were prophets *and* prophets), the Hellenistic influence and the contributions of Paul and of Alexandria. The author confines himself to the period covered by the *N. T.*, *i.e.*, down to about A.D. 150, but we hope he will some day continue the story down to the Council of Nicæa. Nor, as he himself admits (pp. 290 f.) need the enquiry cease there. Christianity has never ceased to borrow while ever remaining creative. Not only Greeks and Latins, but Goths, Teutons and Celts have contributed to the fullness of the body of Christ. In our own day we have seen what China, India and Japan, as well as the peoples of Africa and Polynesia, are bringing into the Kingdom of God (see, *e.g.*, Bishop Montgomery's *Mankind and the Church*).

We heartily commend Dr. Scott's book to all students of early Christian history and literature and to a wider public, and cordially endorse his appreciation of the late Prof. Wm. Morgan's work, *The Religion and Theology of Paul*.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

The Biblical Text of Lucifer of Cagliari (Acts). By A. M. COLEMAN. Printed by J. H. Lawrence, Albion Works, Welwyn, Herts.

Lucifer was one of the most accurate quoters of Scripture in the early centuries of the Christian Church. Nowhere is this fact clearer than in the quotations from *Acts*, where his text agrees very closely with that preserved in the "giant" biblical manuscript at Stockholm. Mr. Coleman has done a useful piece of work for students of the *N.T.* text by copying out Lucifer's quotations in their proper order from the Vienna edition of Lucifer by Hartel, and giving the differences between these and the *gigas* text in notes. He has very wisely taken account of the fresh collation of *gigas* by Karlsson (not "Karlsonn"), instead of relying on the notoriously inaccurate Belsheim. Mr. Coleman will supply his tractate *gratis* to any interested.

A. SOUTER.

A Greek-English Lexicon. Compiled by HENRY GEORGE LIDDELL and ROBERT SCOTT. A New Edition, revised and augmented throughout by HENRY STUART JONES, *etc.* Part 3. *διάλειμμα—ἐξευτελιστης.* Part 4. *ἐξευτονέω—θησαυριστικός.* Clarendon Press. 10s. 6d. net each part. £4 4s. for the whole work.

We have herewith the third and fourth parts of the ten which will complete this admirable revision. The new work has been justly received with a chorus of approval from all civilized countries, and it is superfluous at

this time of day to enlarge on its merits. The immense accessions of inscriptions and of documents on papyrus, as well as the recovery of lost Greek writings associated with the names of Aristotle, Herodes, Menander, Bacchylides, Pindar, and others, during the last forty years, have, quite apart from the general progress of Greek learning, antiquated all older editions of Liddell and Scott. Both these parts contain further "Aids to the Reader" and "Addenda and Corrigenda" to the already issued parts. It may be well to explain that the Biblical Greek vocabulary is incorporated in this work, and that the proper setting of such important words as διάνοια, διασπορά, δίκαιος and its derivatives, δόγμα, δόξα, ἔθνος, εἰρήνη, ἐκκλησία, ἐξουσία, ἐπίσκοπος, εὐαγγέλιον, θεός, is given here according to the latest knowledge. A SOUTER.

The Vedānta. By S. RADHAKRISHNAN. Allen & Unwin. 10s.

Rāmdās and the Rāmdāsīs. By W. S. DEMING, Ph.D. Oxford Press. 6s.

The Indirect Effect of Christian Missions in India. By R. S. WILSON, B.A. Clarke. 6s.

The Pilgrimage of Buddhism. By J. B. PRATT, Ph.D. Macmillan. 15s.

Nippon Shindo Ron. By YUTAKA HIBINO. Cambridge Press. 7s. 6d.

Japan and Christ. By M. S. MURAS and W. H. M. WILTON. C.M.S. 2s. 6d.

We have already noticed in these pages two of Prof. Radhakrishnan's books, *The Philosophy of the Upanishads* and *The Hindu View of Life.* The book before us on *The Vedānta* is an excerpt from the second volume of his great work, *Indian Philosophy.* Here, as elsewhere, Prof. Radhakrishnan writes not only as a historian of philosophy, but as the protagonist of Higher Hinduism. That gives to his work at once its special interest and its limitations. This book will not save the student of Indian thought from the necessity of studying for himself the massive volumes of the *Sacred Books of the East,* which contain Sankara's and Rāmānuja's commentaries on the *Vedāntasūtras,* and for the study of Sankara, the student will still do well to turn to Deussen's *Das System des Vedānta* or Dr. Urquhart's shorter and more recent book, *The Vedānta and Modern Thought.* The missionary especially is concerned to know not only what Sankara taught, but how his teaching, which to us in the West seems over-subtle and remote from human needs, is understood by Hindu philosophers to-day. Prof. Radhakrishnan naturally cites in its defence not only the tenets of Neoplatonists, but modern " absolutist " philosophers like Bradley and Bosanquet. We may sympathize with Prof. Radhakrishnan's claim that Sankara has " a place among the immortals " and that his " system is unmatched for its metaphysical depth and logical power," but it is hard to see in one who held that activity belongs to the realm of ignorance and delusion " a social idealist on the grand scale." The modified monism of Rāmānuja seems better to meet the needs of religion, and Prof. Radhakrishnan claims for it that it " gives the best type of monotheism conceivable, inset with touches of immanentism." The thinkers of the ancient Church found in Neoplatonism at once their deadliest enemy and a philosophy which they utilized to express the Christian message. The Vedānta which Prof. Radhakrishnan explains, defends, and modifies, much resembles that Neoplatonism, but the Indian Church has not yet produced its Origen who could out-think the thinkers of the Vedānta and exhibit Christianity as the answer to its quest for the unseen and the eternal.

Rāmdās and the Rāmdāsïs is a volume of the "Religious Life of India " series, and admirably fulfils the double purpose of that series—to produce

" really reliable information on the leading forms which religious life has taken in India," and to bring the religion described " into relation with Christianity." Dr. Deming, who belongs to the American (Congregational) Marathi Mission, writes not only from full knowledge of the relevant literature, but with the insight gained by long and sympathetic intercourse with the Rāmdāsīs of the Marāthā country. He gives us a very interesting account of the life and teaching of Rāmdās, a Vaishnavite saint who, living at the time when the Marāthās under their great leader Sivājī threw off the Moslem yoke, has still much influence in the Marāthā country. We have had occasion previously to refer to the beautiful hymns of Rāmdās's contemporary and fellow-countryman, Tukārām. Tukārām's devotion gathered around the image at Vithobā of Krishna. The *bhakti* of Rāmdās was directed toward Rāma, the other great *avatār* of Vishnu. It is hard for us to see how a man can be both an Advaitist and a *bhakta.* Thus Sankara is extolled as the writer of fervent hymns to gods who, according to his *advaita* teaching, shared in the *māyā,* the illusion of the whole karmic order. We have the same confusion in the piety of Rāmdās. He was a Vedāntist, and yet at the same time the saint of Rāma, to whom he prayed as if Rāma were not gracious only, but real. The final chapter of this book gives a sympathetic comparison of the teaching of Rāmdās with that of Jesus.

The book is written primarily for the Marāthā people, but it is of interest to all students of Hinduism, for it describes yet another of those saints whose aspirations are nearer far to Christianity than that Vedānta philosophy which is better known to Western scholars. Where so much is given it seems churlish to ask for more. But we hope that Dr. Deming will complete his labour of love by giving us translations of the hymns of Rāmdās. Without such translations it is difficult for those of us ignorant of the Marāthā language to understand the present influence of this Marāthā saint.

The Indirect Effects of Christian Missions in India was awarded the Sir Peregrine Maitland Prize in Cambridge University in 1927. The first half of the book gives a short account of the influence of Christian missions in the spheres of social and religious reform. This part contains little that is not already well-known, but may be of service to those who, having read Miss Mayo's *Mother India,* desire to learn what Christian missions have done to mitigate such evils as those of child-marriage. The latter half of the book is devoted to a criticism of present missionary methods, and especially of the large place which education and organization have taken in the modern missionary enterprise. We do not ourselves agree with all Mr. Wilson's strictures, but the sombre picture which he gives of the present state of the Indian Church—its lack of missionary zeal, its imitativeness, its over-Westernization—is one which deserves careful consideration, especially by those who have to do with the framing of our missionary policy. Mr. Wilson's dissatisfaction may be excessive, but it is a dissatisfaction which is shared by some of the ablest of Indian Christians and the keenest of our younger missionaries

Dr. Pratt's *The Pilgrimage of Buddhism* is a big book of nearly 800 pages, but it is written with a freshness and lucidity which holds the reader's attention from start to finish. It is a traveller's book, for it is based largely on impressions gained by the author in two sabbatical years spent in visiting Buddhist lands. Travellers' books on religion are usually superficial and misleading. But Dr. Pratt is not an ordinary traveller. An expert in the philosophy of religion, he prepared himself for his tours by a close study of the relevant literature. He tells us that in his book

he has sought " to make Buddhism plausible," and to help his readers to understand " how it feels to be a Buddhist." The first of these aims has its perils, which we doubt if Dr. Pratt has entirely overcome. Thus the opening chapters, which describe the life and teaching of the Buddha, seem to us too " plausible." The first thing that the student of Indian religion has to learn is that the Law of Excluded Middle does not apply. A can be B and not B at one and the same time and in one and the same sense. Dr. Pratt's account seems to us to give a picture of the Buddha's life and work which is too intelligible to be entirely true. The distinctive value of his book lies in its record of his personal impressions of the modern Buddhist world. Not only does he vividly describe the temples and monastic orders of Buddhist lands; he gives us very interesting glimpses into the minds of leading Buddhists whom he met, and in that way throws much light on the attempts of Eastern Buddhist scholars to adapt Buddhism to modern needs. A final chapter deals with Buddhism and Christianity.

Dr. Pratt speaks with admiration of the liberality of outlook and the activity in social service of the majority of Christian missionaries, but is outspoken in his condemnation of missionaries of the Fundamentalist type, who, knowing nothing of non-Christian religions, see in them no truth and regard them only as enemies to be destroyed. His criticism of such missionaries is doubtless justified, but even the least attractive of them are zealous for the spread of Christianity. Dr. Pratt's own position is much like that of Troeltsch. It is not that of classic Christian faith. Christian missions find their impulse from the belief that the central Christian truth of God revealed in Christ is not, as Dr. Pratt holds, merely " a symbol of the mystery that no man has solved." It is actually true. And for those who believe that God has thus revealed Himself in Christ there is an obligation to seek to make that revelation known not to the " barbarian " only, but to all alike. Although we do not agree with all its conclusions, we have read this book with much interest and gratitude, and would commend it warmly to all who seek a sympathetic and competent account of the past history and present influence of the most attractive of all non-Christian religions.

Nippon Shindo Ron is, as its title denotes, a description of the ideal " Way of the Japanese Subject." Its translator, Mr. A. P. McKenzie, points out that the importance of the book " is due to the fact that it deals exclusively with conceptions with which every Japanese is familiar." It describes that religious patriotism which is taught to Japanese youths, for whom devotion to the sacred Imperial House is the first and greatest of all duties. Shinto, with its myth of the divine ancestry of the dynasty, and Confucianism, with its high ethical teaching, are here combined in the exaltation of loyalty to the Emperor. In Chinese Confucianism, filial piety was the paramount virtue. Here every virtue is valid only as it is subordinated to loyalty to the Emperor. The utter obedience of son to father, of wife to husband, find their place in common service to the Crown. The book is of interest as expressing the ideals of that intense loyalty to the State which has helped to give Japan its present pre-eminence in the Far East. As we read it, we remember Nurse Cavell's words, " Patriotism is not enough." In this book patriotism is regarded as a final end, and there is an adulation of the " sacred Emperor " which comes very near to Cæsar-worship.

Such teaching must make the work of the Christian Churches in Japan very difficult. The book, *Japan and Christ,* written by a Japanese clergyman and an English missionary, speaks more of hope than of achievement. The Catholic Missions in the sixteenth century had such quick success

that at the time of their extermination " it is estimated that between 1614 and 1635 a quarter of a million Japanese suffered for their faith." To-day, out of a population of some sixty millions, less than three hundred thousand are Christians. The Church, we are told, is " middle-class," and strong only in the cities. The economic difficulties of recent years have led to a strong labour movement, and its leaders are hostile to Christianity. It is the church of the *bourgeoisie.* This book, in giving us an obviously honest account of the present position of Christianity in Japan, thus reminds us of the essential unity of the problems which confront the Church in West and East. And the book is all the more valuable in that, although published by a missionary society, it is written, not to "encourage" home-supporters, but only to give the facts. Its authors' confidence for the future comes from their faith in Christ alone, not from any optimistic reading of the present power and prospects of Christianity in Japan. SYDNEY CAVE.

Christian Thought: A Grammar of Reinterpretation. By F. W. BUTLER. S.P.C.K. 6s.

Mr. Butler is the author of several books which have received a cordial welcome. The present short volume suggests, in an interesting way, many of the problems underlying Christian faith, and very confidently offers solutions. It is a pity that the sentences are sometimes not merely long, but involved. If the author—or the printer—would have employed a few more commas, even that might have helped the reader.[1]

The primary emphasis is laid upon the necessity of metaphysics, or upon the impossibility of a schism between faith and scientific knowledge. 'Ware Ritschl!

One instalment of metaphysics is to be a rehabilitated natural theology, upon the lines of Prof. Sorley's work. Values, especially moral values, are facts—given facts, presented to us as definitely as are those external phenomena which physical science investigates. If, then, we are to think together things and persons, external nature and the values, we must infer a living, and moral, and (I suppose) a gracious God. The traditional Theistic arguments are indeed waved aside (pp. 41, 42) more definitely than by Sorley himself; but the train of thought shared with Prof. Sorley—according to p. 54 it amounts to a restatement of the contrasted " moral argument "—effectively replaces them. High tributes are paid to moral and religious experience; and yet in the end God seems to be demonstrated by logical proof.

Next, in order to make connexion with Christianity, we have to emphasize the importance of *deed.* In the light of this postulate, " theoretical knowledge " and " practical knowledge " come together again, in spite of Kantian efforts to separate and contrast them. The " Unitary problem "—in Mr. Butler's rather unfamiliar vocabulary this appears to mean the only legitimate approval to Christian faith—is the question, How can our weak or even impotent wills be reinforced? And the answer is, By the inexhaustibly significant deed of Christ, experienced through all the ages in the believing soul as the power of God which imparts salvation.

It is no small pleasure to be offered anything so devout and so Christian by a knight-errant who approaches us waving as his pennon the banner of metaphysics. And yet there are difficulties. Mr. Butler's version of the essence of Christianity *leuchtet nicht sogar ein;* some minds, at least, will find it obscure. Besides which—speaking without prejudice, and offering

[1] Herrmann of Marburg never wrote his name " Hermann." And what has poor Browning done that he should be debited with the terrible line—

" Nor spirit helps flesh more than flesh helps spirit "?

a mere *obiter dictum*—one seems bound to recognize at least two other approaches to the gospel of our salvation. There are those who (with Ritschl) find no satisfaction in any lower ground of religious certainty than Christ Jesus. We " by Him do believe in God." And again, there is the problem of forgiveness—thrown to the front in the immortal Epistle to the Romans, and recently urged upon us by the persuasive pen of Dr. H. R. Mackintosh, as if the experience of the forgiven soul were the one thing that mattered in heaven or on earth. Can it be true that there is only one single gate into the City of God? Are there not sundry and diverse gates? And is not each several gate a pearl?

When he deals with the newest science, the author seems to welcome it as discrediting materialism and naturalism. Accordingly, in the strength of such wiser insight, he challenges the " History of Religion " school—they stand for a religious naturalism, and naturalism is out of date! Surely that is a dangerous short cut. The dogmatic theologian of the " History of Religion " school is Troeltsch; and Troeltsch's basis appears to be the assertion that all metaphysics are bad (for the purposes of religion), and that *all religions are good*. This involves in an extreme form that severance between faith and scientific knowledge which Mr. Butler so much, and perhaps so wisely, distrusts; but it is hardly fair to call it naturalism, or to suggest that the discrediting of naturalistic science shuts us up to supernaturalism in studying religion. The conclusion may be sound enough; the argument by which Mr. Butler reaches it appears precarious. Again, Mr. Butler himself does not seem to carry his vindication of non-Christian religions further than the *O.T.* His definition of Christ as God's saving *deed* is as supernaturalistic as it could be. It may be none the worse for that, but we must face frankly what such a position involves. At the moment it is certainly out of fashion. Even trusted leaders like Bartlet and Carlyle rebuke Ritschl for " isolating specific Christian experience." Has Ritschl done anything worse than proclaim Christ as the light of the whole world?

It does not satisfy Mr. Butler's thirst for objectivity to make the high assertion, with Christian faith, of the absoluteness of the gift of God in Christ. Here, too, we must have metaphysical formulation—in the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Trinity. In regard to these the author's attitude appears to be not so much re-statement, or even reinterpretation, as—reiteration. Nothing is said about the difficulties attaching to these great dogmas, or about the far-reaching differences of meaning which divide their champions. Hard as it may be to secure tolerance for a less dogmatic evangelicalism, that is a road which must be explored.

ROBERT MACKINTOSH.

The Will To Be Free. By H. V. KNOX. Constable. 10s. 6d.

Captain Knox has chosen an apt title for his book. We are conscious throughout of his personal will to be free, and of his resolution to fight valiantly for a conviction which is vital to his own philosophy of life. As Dr. L. P. Jacks and Prof. J. A. Stewart point out in their preface, he is not merely upholding Voluntarism as against Determinism, nor is he seeking to refute any one Determinist. He is striving against the doubts and difficulties which rise within his own mind. He wants to show that the question, " Where do We come in? " is a legitimate one, and he hopes to answer it by proving that as conscious beings we are effective, we do make a difference in the universe. This effort of his is in itself a sign that philosophy is nothing if not an immense exertion of will, striving to hold the position already won.

Captain Knox gives a brief statement of the Deterministic position, which states that only the necessary is intelligible, and whose fundamental principle is "Whatever is, must be." Voluntarists, he continues, never accept the summary dismissal by Determinists of Free Will as unintelligible according to this first principle. They cannot surrender lightly a belief so essential to a philosophy which asserts the reality of the self, which is convinced that human beings do possess initiative which is capable of breaking into the routine of Nature, and making some impression on it. The author is of the opinion, however, that in the past they have been too willing to admit that the Determinists have the support of traditional logic. The truth is that too often Determinists hide behind the slogan that philosophy should adopt scientific methods. This, if pursued to its logical conclusion, means that it should maintain abstraction from personality, a limitation of scope which science may make for itself if it chooses, but is not justified in imposing elsewhere. Thus no account is taken of the commonsense world of practical reality in which alone free will has any real meaning, and the Determinist, professing to rely on the scientific method and the conclusions of formal logic, is really in the position of the Chancellor in Mr. Brighouse's play, *The Prince who was a Piper* :—

> *Lizina*: Where is the Prince? Ought he not to be here by now?
>
> *Chancellor*: Yes. But I have not been notified of his arrival. Therefore he has not arrived.
>
> *Lizina*: You're sure that follows?
>
> *Chancellor:* An arrival which is not notified is not an arrival.

It is just this rigid and uncritical acceptance of the findings of formal logic to which Captain Knox takes exception, and so he proposes to refute Determinists, not by a re-statement of the Voluntarist position, not by sentimental apologetics, but by open counter-attack upon the logic of Determinism.

He lays bare a certain ambiguity which, though very subtle, appears, nevertheless, again and again. Thus, it is suicidal to identify logical necessity with psychological necessity, for so truth disappears. As psychologists we still have to account for the vital illusion of freedom, even if as Determinists we abolish it as unreal. The Determinists may try to avoid a confession of psychological incompetence by identifying freedom with chance. But this identification can only mean that there is something ambiguous about a necessity which has some connexion with chance.

Again, Determinism is divided against itself. Determinism B is purely objective and physical. It refuses to recognize will, asks how, and never why. This is in apparent conflict with Determinatism A, which includes purpose and professes to be a theory of the will, though it admits will only to dismiss it immediately as negligible. Reconciliation between the two is only possible if it is allowed that Determinism A leads all the while to pure materialism. But there is further ambiguity here.

Determinism, therefore, appears as a theory of the human will which verbally accepts the reality of volition, but denies that will is free.

We may delight in Captain Knox's dialectic skill, admit the truth of many of his criticisms, and come away convinced of his sincerity. But if we follow the arguments whither they lead us, with open minds, as the author himself suggests, we may find at the end of the book that we are back again at the beginning, pondering on the unanswered problem that necessity is meaningless if Free Will is wholly unreal, and, on the other hand, that freedom has no significance if necessity is of no account.

M. Sowby.

Science and Personality. By WILLIAM BROWN. Oxford Press. 12s. 6d.

This book is a sequel to *Mind and Personality,* which Dr. Brown published about two years ago, and, as he says, is an " attempt to deal more thoroughly with the problem of personality in its relation to science and to the general concept of value." It may be said at once that the book is a thoroughly sound contribution to the psychology of personality. Dr. Brown has the great advantage of being both a philosopher and a psychologist and of having a wide medical experience, particularly in the treatment of borderland mental cases. His approach to his subject, therefore, is thoroughly scientific in method and entirely without preconceptions, and this makes the conclusions he reaches all the more sure and significant. Though he illustrates his position freely from his medical experience, he never makes the mistake—so common among medical psychologists—of confusing the abnormal with the normal and of working exclusively from the former to the latter. Though much of his work is critical and analytic, on the positive side he reaches some very definite conclusions in regard to the nature of personality and to the relations between mind and body —conclusions which carry one a long way in the direction of a spiritual interpretation of human life. The whole book is both interesting and informing, but the general reader will probably be most attracted by Dr. Brown's treatment of the relation between religion and health, and between personality and psychical research. In connexion with the former subject he gives a very interesting treatment of Christian Science and of spiritual healing, and is by no means wholly critical or condemnatory. The same is true of psychical research, in connexion with which he uses both his own experience of the power of hypnotic suggestion and experience gathered through attendance at *séances.* While he confesses that his own personal belief in survival is based on other grounds than those of psychical research, he feels as a scientist that the phenomena which psychical research presents are worthy of the most careful investigation and have a real bearing upon the subject. The concluding chapter in his book is entitled " Faith, Love, and Personality," and is a very fine plea for the recognition of the eternal values involved in all these terms.

W. B. SELBIE.

SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST.

*(Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading.)*

Mr. E. R. Trattner describes his *Unravelling the Book of Books* (Scribner's, 7s. 6d.) as "the story of how the puzzles of the Bible were solved and its documents unravelled." The volume is a popularization of Biblical criticism, and is very readable. It is one of the selections of the American " Book of the Month Club."

Mr. Robert Keable's *The Great Galilean* (Cassell, 4s. 6d.) will provide material for the psycho-analysts, enrage the orthodox, and stimulate the thoughtful. Mr. Keable believes that no biography of Jesus is possible, and that the Christ of the Church is the Traditional and not the Historical Christ. Jesus was an amazingly ignorant man: His belief that God was Father of men was a guess, and it was wrong. Nevertheless He had a "peculiarly sincere, pellucid, and loving heart," and "a perfectly undistorted mind on everything." Paul, on the other hand, had " a mind so twisted and distorted and ignorant that he was incapable of making reasonable judgments upon biology, or psychology, or history," and he left the Church a legacy of " muddled thinking." The important Mount in the story of

Jesus is that of the Sermon, not of Calvary, which is " an unredeemed and stark tragedy, because it was the nipping of an experiment in the bud and the execution of the experimenter." Mr. Keable's own "reconstruction " of the earthly life of Jesus is given in an appendix.

Mr. Keable is obsessed with questions of sex and marriage. " Indissoluble marriage has resulted among us in a million homes from which love has flown out of the window." The " historic Jesus " is " the advocate of free love," which is the opposite of promiscuous lust. Marriages should be dissoluble "until they have proved themselves indissoluble in their own nature."

Nothing like so cocksure and so provocative, and—it must be confessed —nothing like so well written as Mr. Keable's book, is Dr. Walter Russell Bowie's *The Master* (Murray, 7s. 6d.), a modest, scholarly presentation of the life of Jesus. Dr. Bowie succeeds in his attempt to create a portrait —and it is specially interesting to watch how, using the Gospel materials, the portrait grows under his brush immediately after one has been told by Mr. Keable that the thing is impossible.

Dean Shailer Mathews has earned the place he occupies as one of the most trusted leaders of religious thought in the United States. His latest book, *Jesus On Social Institutions* (Macmillan, 6s. 6d.) should be on the shelves of all ministers. After dealing with " Jesus and the Revolutionary Spirit " and " Jesus and Social Attitudes," Dean Mathews summarizes the teaching of Jesus on the family, on wealth, the State, and the Church, and then has a concluding chapter on " The Social Gospel of Jesus." The book had its origin in a study of the revolutionary spirit in preparation for a book on the French Revolution, which in part explains why it touches modern problems at every point.

Dr. W. H. Robinson's *The Parables of Jesus in their Relation to His Ministry* (Chicago and Cambridge University Presses, 10s.) is a fresh and interesting study of the parable method. Dr. Robinson's argument is that Jesus always used the parables to make truth plain, and that their interpretation is clear if we can discover their original setting.

In *The Trial of Jesus Christ* (Newnes, 2s.) Lord Shaw of Dunfermline examines the Gospel records and shows how and where the trial was illegal.

We wish the publishers had not been quite so reticent about *The History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge* (Blackie, 25s.) We learn that it is " A Collective Work," that Dr. T. R. Glover helped " in the early stages," and that it is a companion to *Evolution in the Light of Modern Knowledge* (1925). The name of the editor is not given, nor are we informed on what principles he has mapped out the subject. This gives us pause, especially when we notice that 425 pages are employed to bring the story to the death of Paul, and, of the remaining 334, " After the Reformation" is given only 120 pp. The chapter on " 17th Century Dissent " is extremely scrappy, unsatisfactory, and ill-proportioned; there is no mention at all of the Pilgrim Fathers, of the Plymouth Colony, or the later Puritan settlement at Boston, while 10 pages are given to Jansenism! A chapter like this compares ill with many of the earlier contributions, of which those of Prof. Gilbert Murray, Dr. George Milligan, Dr. C. Anderson Scott, Dr. Edwyn Bevan, and Prof. Dodd may be mentioned. Altogether the list of contributors for the earlier periods is very imposing. It leaves us with the impression that the work was first planned on a much larger scale, and that when the foundations had been laid it was discovered that there was not sufficient money to erect the building.

Dr. W. A. Visser 'T Hooft's **The Background of the Social Gospel in America* (Milford, 5s.) is both curious and valuable. It is printed, badly printed, in Haarlem, and there are many slips in it: it has strange omissions, allowing little for British influence on American thought in the last hundred years, though quoting abundantly from German—and from recent German—books. But it is an extremely thoughtful and suggestive book which ought to be widely read both here and in America. Starting out from the prevailing impression at international conferences that "American Christianity emphasizes the social aspects of the Gospel to an uncommon degree," the author asks what this social gospel is, traces its relation to "The Puritan Background" (an excellent chapter), and the contribution of the Enlightenment, of Revivalism, and of Science to its development. In a final chapter the "underlying theology" of the social gospel is discussed, and a forecast made on the following lines:—

> "Until very recently America's spiritual (like its economic) history has been one of dependence on Europe. Puritanism, Enlightenment, Methodism, Science, all of these came in some way or another from the old continent to the new. But in the social gospel, the product of all these in their combination with that intangible reality, the American temper, America produced a type of religious thought which was largely its own. The social gospel is therefore, in a sense, the first expression of America's religious life, which is truly born in America itself. May it, therefore, not be that America is yet at the beginning of the process of finding itself?"

Many of the works quoted by the Dutch scholar whose book has just been reviewed are used in Dr. Parkes Cadman's *The Christ of God* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.), but in addition we see both from the bibliography and the lectures themselves how Dr. Cadman not only makes use of, but keeps in touch with, English literature and theology. The five lectures in this admirable little book, which has the common fault of American books in being too dear, deal with "The Christ of Christian Tradition," "The Threefold Approach to the Person of Christ," "The Christ of a Growing Experience," "The Christ in a Modern World," and "The Christ of To-morrow." Lecture III deals succinctly and faithfully with lives of Jesus like those of Bruce Barton, Renan, Middleton Murry, Ludwig, and Gamaliel Bradford.

Social Principles of the Gospel (Macmillan, 10s.) is apparently an abridged translation from the French of Abbé Lugan's *Les Grandes Directives Sociales*, which is part of a larger work, *The Social Teachings of Jesus*. The book discusses the teaching and practice of Jesus in regard to the individual, the family, society, fraternity, equality, and liberty. It is interesting to compare a Roman Catholic work like this with those of Dr. Cadman and Dr. Shailer Mathews.

Except by those who attend International Conferences, Bishop Francis J. McConnell, of the Methodist Episcopal Church of America, is not well konwn in this country. But he ought to be, both because he is worth knowing and because he has recently succeeded Dr. Cadman as President of the Federal Council of Churches. The lectures in his *Humanism and Christianity* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.) are therefore specially welcome just now, and we hope they will have many British readers. They are discursive and loosely strung together, but they reveal an eminently practical mind applying Christianity to human life to-day.

Dr. J. G. Gilkey, of Springfield, Mass., is one of the most esteemed Congregational ministers in New England, and he has already written several forceful books in which he presents the modern view of the Christian faith. We recommend **The Certainty of God* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.) to all

ministers and those who have to teach young people. It faces up to questions like: "Do we really know there is a God?"; "Can we reconcile God's love and the world's pain?"; "Does God have a purpose for individuals?" Dr. Gilkey has a wealth of apt illustration at command, and he uses it well, and the result is a satisfying piece of popular apologetic.

The Rev. L. D. Weatherhead, a Wesleyan minister, has conceived the plan of studying the idea of immortality in the Victorian poets. *The After-World of the Poets* (Sharp, 5s.) gathers together the relevant passages, not merely from Wordsworth, Tennyson, and Browning, the "big three," but from Shelley, Arnold, Clough, and Swinburne. The book is much more than a catena of references, however, for Mr. Weatherhead's discussion of the subject is extremely fresh and suggestive. Prof. Peake writes a Foreword.

All the ten papers in the Rev. Henry Bett's *Studies in Religion* (Sharp, 5s.) are sound and scholarly; the writer seems equally at home estimating Eckart or Joachim of Flora, or with subjects like "The Origin of God" and "The Problem of Prayer."

Sadhu Sundar Singh's *With and Without Christ* (Cassell, 3s.) consists of "incidents taken from the lives of Christians and non-Christians which illustrate the difference in lives lived with Christ and without Christ." This scarcely gives a complete account of the book, for one chapter is autobiographical, contrasting the Sadhu's own life with and without Christ.

In *Slaves of the Gods* (Cape, 7s. 6d.) Miss Katherine Mayo returns to the task she set herself in *Mother India*. The twelve stories in the present volume are all based on fact, and are supported by first-hand quotations. The book is as revolting and as sincere as its predecessor. It is to be hoped that it will help to arouse Indians to drastic efforts to free their land from the terrible ills Miss Mayo describes.

The Rev. James Luke's *Pioneering in Mary Slessor's Country* (Sharp, 5s.) is a very readable account of a life spent in missionary service in Calabar. It reveals the tremendous cost in human life and health of this African enterprise.

Canon S. C. Carpenter's earnestness is as attractive as his breezy style, and there is much that is good in his *Democracy in Search of a Religion* (S. C. M., 6s.). Sometimes, however, the Canon strides ahead at such a pace that we find it hard to follow, and when we reach him we discover that in some way he has managed to become involved in a defence of episcopacy, or something of the kind. On the whole, however, we find a tramp with the Canon is an excellent tonic, and some of the views he shows us—as of the place of "Saints" in the Church and in the world—are unforgettable. And there are telling sentences, of which one may be quoted: "The death of a martyr always lights an Easter-candle, which grows into a Pentecostal flame."

"Let me assure my readers that this is intended as a very constructive book." So says Dr. R. W. Sellers at the end of *Religion Coming of Age* (Macmillan, 10s. 6d.). We do not know about "constructive": it strikes us as ill-digested! Dr. Sellars seems to have something worth while to say, but we are not quite clear what it is. Quotations tumble over each other in his pages, but it looks as if he has never quite assimilated them. Much of his analysis of religion to-day is sound, but he does not seem to us to build up that constructive synthesis which is his aim.

Dr. H. T. Hodgkin's *Personality and Progress* (S. C. M., 4s. 6d.) is a thoughtful little book demanding reality and adventure, the quietness of

spirit, honesty of purpose, true education, and sincere religion that will eventually result in harmony and reconciliation. It is a fresh and persuasive plea for true character, on which " the forward march of humanity " above all depends.

Frankly, we are tired of books about women, and wish the stream would cease. If in parts Dr. Meyrick Booth's *Women and Society* (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.) is too much like an evening paper, yet on the whole his practical commonsense should serve to bring theorists to solid earth. He urges that leaders of female education make a great mistake in treating girls as if they were boys, and in not recognizing the positive worth of what is directly feminine, and suggests that they should have a typical, if feminine, life-ideal. The bi-polarity of life, he insists, is central, and he has no patience with doctrinaires who confuse the distinction—man's primary function is to create food and wealth for the community, woman's to bear and rear the children of the community. True sex equality is based upon this duality of nature and function.

Mrs. Graham Wallas's *Before the Bluestockings* (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.) endeavours, by describing individual cases, to portray the life of the educated Englishwoman from the Restoration to 1730. Mrs. Wallas has given us a book that is both informing and entertaining, though we should not have liked to try Mrs. Woolley's " Balsoms, Salves, Oyntments, Waters for Wounds, Oyles, Cordials, and the like " !

The Rev. E. W. Hirst calls his *Ethical Love: Its Basis and Expression* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) " an essay in Social Idealism." It is a picture of what mankind should be—a band of brothers gathered into a world-household. The roots of Ethical Love, Mr. Hirst argues, lie deeper than sex or parentalism: the " Life-tendency " is an impulse towards the social enrichment in life in all who possess it," sex being a " specific differentiation of this impulse." Man being fundamentally social, his life should aim at the creation of a world family, the political and economic relations of which Mr. Hirst proceeds to discuss. A thoughtful book, of special service to the present discontents.

Uniform volumes are Dr. James Carter's *The Gospel Message in Great Pictures* and the Rev. W. R. Gobrecht's *The Gospel Message in Great Poems* (Funk & Wagnalls, $2.00 each). Dr. Carter deals with fifteen well-known religious pictures, Mr. Gobrecht with eighteen ancient and modern poems. The weakest thing in the volumes is Mr. Gobrecht's explanation for giving each sermon a Scripture text.

The Kingsgate Press has published three useful books—the Rev. G. O. Griffith's *A Pocket History of the Baptist Movement* (2s. 6d.); Dr. J. H. Rushbrooke's *Some Chapters of European Baptist History* (2s. 6d.); and Dr. W. T. Whitley's and the Rev. M. E. Aubrey's **The Work of a Minister* (3s. 6d.), which is full of wise counsel.

Dr. Ozora S. Davis, who has just laid down the Moderatorship of the National Council of Congregational Churches after a very active term of office, has, in *Preaching on Church and Community Occasions* (Chicago and Cambridge University Presses, 12s. 6d.) provided a most useful volume of outline addresses for special services. The collection will be less useful in England than in the United States, with its multitude of special days of all kinds—we have, *e.g.*, Prison Sunday, Labour Sunday, Veterans' Sunday—but preachers everywhere could benefit by looking at the suggestions, say, for Communion, Ordination, and Funeral Services, as well as those for the great festivals of the Church.

A book which reviews " modern cults and creeds "—including the Society of Friends, the Plymouth Brethren, Christian Science, Faith Healing, Spiritualism, Russellism, Theosophy, The New Thought, and the Roman Church—in 170 pp., cannot pretend to give more than slight treatment, and the Rev. E. T. Vernon's *Beliefs of To-day* (Clarke, 5s.) cannot be said to furnish more than an introduction for those who have no acquaintance with the subject. Those who desire a more thorough treatment should get Dr. Glenn Atkins's *Modern Religious Cults and Movements,* to which Mr. Vernon expresses indebtedness.

Dr. G. J. Slosser's *Christian Unity, Its History and Challenge* (Kegan Paul, 21s.), which secured its author a London Ph.D., is a work of remarkable industry. It surveys all the movements for Christian Unity from the Council of Jerusalem to the present day, and is completely furnished with statistics, charts, and chronological summaries. Dr. Slosser does not limit himself to movements between the denominations, but includes Missionary, Sunday School, and other movements, as well as " Copec " and the like. A most useful book of reference.

It is both refreshing and rare to find a scholar who is at the same time an enthusiast. Prof. Allison Peers has translated into English many of the works of Ramon Lull, and he has evidently come to love him, and his biography *Ramon Lull* (S.P.C.K., 18s.) is all the more attractive for that reason. Those who enjoyed Mrs. Robertson's article on Lull in our last number will read this volume with avidity, and they and others will not fail to learn much from it. Lull was one of the most attractive figures of his century, and he has come to his own in recent years. As mystic and as missionary he is alike of interest to us, while not even Baxter was so mastered by the *cacoethes scribendi*—he certainly wrote hundreds of books, some have said thousands. Prof. Peers is to be congratulated on bringing to a conclusion this study, and in making Catalan literature known to the English-speaking peoples.

How is it possible to convey to British readers the position Mr. William Allen White holds in the United States? Mix Mr. Birrell and "A. G. G.," G. W. E. Russell and Herbert Paul, give the resulting amalgam an American accent, and you have something like William Allen White. Easily the most fascinating book we have read this quarter is Mr. White's *Masks in a Pageant* (Macmillan, 21s.), a study of the leading figures in American politics during the last 40 years. Croker, Platt—the "bosses" or "old Kings"; Harrison, Grover Cleveland, and McKinley (" early Stuarts "); and " two Warwicks " (Mark Hanna and Bryan) are described in wonderfully vivid fashion. Then we have the figures of the " Great Rebellion "—Roosevelt, Taft, and Wilson; of the Restoration—Harding and Coolidge; and finally two "young princes of democracy," Al Smith and Big Bill Thompson.

Mr. White writes in an entrancing style that carries the reader along like Froude or Macaulay, and there is a piquancy about it all that makes it very palatable. White was a friend of Roosevelt, and he manages to convey something of the magic of Roosevelt's personality. We marvelled in American Colleges in 1920 when we heard repeatedly of the three great American Presidents—Washington, Lincoln, and Roosevelt! The first two seemed to us quite 6 feet, and Wilson perhaps four feet and a half, but Roosevelt merely a voluble nine inches. Mr. White makes us see him as an example for youth who manages to get his personality across to youth, and almost inclines us to believe that his true height is about 3 feet.

Mr. Allen White is a veteran who has seen American political life from

the inside. He has no illusions about it, and he describes what he has seen with more than the accuracy of a photograph, for the colour is never missing. And he has always seen both sides; he quotes a battle-scarred old Republican in whose district he was about to speak as " whispering noisily in my ear as he was about to introduce me most fulsomely as some Galahad of reform: ' And now, Bill, for God's sake don't get too damned conscientious in this speech '."

We called Prof. R. Coupland's *Wilberforce* one of the finest biographies of recent years, and we were delighted to see his name on *Kirk on the Zambesi* (Oxford Press, 18s.), the first volume of the life of Sir John Kirk, who lived on to a comparatively recent date. Kirk went as botanist and doctor on Livingstone's Zambesi expedition, and so far in the story, which is brought down to the end of the expedition in 1863, Livingstone's personality is dominant. We are shown the great explorer's weak points as well as his heroic courage and dauntless devotion, with Kirk as a skilful and reliable lieutenant. Prof. Coupland's wonderful gift of narrative is again evident in this work, which is as entrancing in its style as it is informing in its subject matter. We eagerly await the continuation.

Joseph Estlin Carpenter (Oxford Press, 10s. 6d.) is an account of the life and work of one who for long occupied a central position in British Unitarianism. His learning ranged over many fields, but especially those of comparative religion and Biblical scholarship, though his biographies of his aunt, Mary Carpenter, and of Martineau, showed great skill. The volume is edited by Prof. C. H. Herford; the Rev. J. H. Weatherall provides " Recollections of an Oxford Student at Manchester College "; Dr. L. R. Farnell writes on Carpenter's contributions to the study of comparative religion; and Dr. Peake, in a chapter that has useful summaries of the present state of Biblical knowledge, on Carpenter's work in that sphere. A bibliography is provided by the Rev. R. V. Holt.

Had not A. G. G.'s character sketches a safe seat in our minds, we should have been inclined to give the highest praise to Mr. Stuart Hodgson's *Portraits and Reflections* (Nisbet, 5s.). They are, indeed, very good, not least those that deal with non-political figures like Low, Capablanca, and Henry Ford. Of the political sketches those on Mussolini, Mr. J. H. Thomas, and Lady Astor strike us as particularly successful. Special mention should be made of the extraordinarily apt quotations placed at the head of each study. For Lord Birkenhead, *e.g.*, we have Cervantes' " Every man is as God made Him, and many a time much worse "; for Sir William Joynson Hicks, Theodore Hook's " I beg your pardon, sir. But are you a person of some importance? "; for Low, Anatole France's " His glance pierced you through and through, uncovering your very bones. You were worse than naked; you were a skeleton"; and for Sir Austen Chamberlain, Coleridge's " He holds him with his glittering eye."

The motif, black and white, runs through the format as well as the contents of the Rev. E. W. Smith's competent biography, *Aggrey of Africa* (S.C.M., 7s. 6d.). Aggrey was one of the most remarkable of modern Africans, and his sudden death in 1927 brought keen regret to all who knew how he was being used of God to interpret black and white to each other. Born on the Gold Coast in 1875, he became a teacher there, afterwards (1898) sailing for America. He became student, professor, and pastor, and his knowledge, tact, and eloquence gave him a place on the Phelps-Stokes Commissions. At the College founded at Achimota on the Gold Coast he was just beginning the work for which his life seemed to have been a preparation when death overtook him.

Aggrey had a boy's vanity and love of praise—he writes to his wife, "I spoke, and touched the colour question, but did it in a way that captivated all of them. I was given an ovation." But his vanity was never offensive, for it was combined with the humility and unselfishness which always accompany true greatness. His message to his people may be summed up in the words:

> "The co-operation of Black and White is essential; the white cannot keep the black in the mud without remaining there himself; Blacks must cease to hate Whites—not all Whites are bad; Blacks must learn to help themselves, and not distract their attentions by casting their eyes overseas for salvation."

Mr. C. F. Andrews is entirely *sui generis,* and it is safe to say that no biography exists quite like his *Zaka Ullah of Delhi* (Heffer, 7s. 6d.). Mr. Andrews lived in Delhi from 1904 to 1912, and became intimate with two of its most striking old men, Munshi Zaka Ullah and Maulvi Nazir Ahmad, Musalman scholars and supporters of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan and the Aligarh movement. Dr. Ahmad, who died in 1912, contributes a touching memoir of his friend, whom Mr. Andrews reveals as a man of deep religion, wide learning, and beautiful spirit. He was born in 1832, his father and grandfather being devout sons of Islam, and he saw through the Mutiny, of which we have a thrilling account. He made it his life work to write in, and translate into, Urdu, his post of Professor of Vernacular Learning and Science at Allahabad serving as a lever. To him India's greatest need was religious toleration: he held that the differences between Hindu and Musalman were too great for any permanent union, and that England would always be needed in India as a balancing power.

We are grateful to Mr. Andrews for the glimpses of Old Delhi in these pages, but especially for sharing his friend with us. To him we seem to be indebted also for the selection, *Thoughts from Rabindranath Tagore* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.), a prose anthology mostly from writings of the sage hitherto unpublished in England. There are four excellent portraits.

Mr. Andrews introduces, and Rabindranath Tagore writes a Foreword to, Mr. G. S. Dutt's *A Woman of India* (Hogarth Press, 4s. 6d.), an Indian Civil Servant's life of his wife, Saroj Nalini, a Bengali lady. Born in 1887, she had, before her death at the age of 37, done much for Indian women, and founded the Women's Institute Movement in India.

If books like Prof. A. F. Pollard's *Wolsey* (Longmans, 21s.) are to be the fruit of learned leisure, it would be wise to insist that professors retire earlier. It seems half a lifetime since we read Prof. Pollard's *Henry VIII,* and his literary output during the last two decades has been disappointingly small. We therefore welcome this volume, which will without doubt become the authoritative biography. It is soundly based on the sources, and it shows us the real Wolsey, not a highly coloured picture like Bishop Creighton's. Not that Prof. Pollard is biased or unsympathetic: he lets us see Wolsey's brilliance and charm and his great talents—but he does not hide the warts. The concluding words are worth quoting:—

> But, while service to an England, that was growing young as well as old, redeemed both him and others from baser servitudes to meaner things, he never rose to service which is perfect freedom. The world was too much with him: he craved, not for a heart of grace but for the husks of glory. "Glorious," says Sir Thomas More, "was hee very farre above all measure, and that was great pitie; for it dyd harme and made him abuse many great gyftes that God hadde given him."

Miss Elisabeth Brockbank's *Richard Hubberthorne of Yealand* (Friends' Book Centre, 3s. 6d.) brought back memories of one of the happiest weeks we ever spent, tramping, pack on back, to see the old Quaker meeting-houses in North Lancashire and Westmorland. From that district came Hubberthorne, one of the first Quaker " publishers of truth." He was born in 1628, became a captain in Cromwell's army, met Fox and was "convinced" in 1652, and henceforth gave himself to journeyings oft and to writing continually in the Quaker cause. He died in Newgate in 1662, ranking with John Penry as one who, while yet young, laid down his life for truth and freedom. Fox said of him :—

> Dear Innocent Richard! As Innocent a man as liveth on Earth, whose Innocency manifested itself and his life is amongst us, and dead he yet liveth: Who never turned his back, but conquered through truth, but trampled upon all evill spirits and went over them; who for the truth laid down his life, and in it he liveth and resteth.

Mr. R. Everett Jayne's *Jonas Hanway* (Sharp, 2s. 6d.) is a well-written account of one of the most picturesque of Englishmen, one who, though he amuses us often, yet did an immense amount of good by his pen, his philanthropies, and his public services.

We confess to a great liking for biography, but the *Great Short Biographies of the World* (Heinemann, 8s. 6d.) is rather overfacing. Its 1,418 pages contain 49 biographies, starting with Diogenes Laertius on Socrates, and Plutarch on Alexander the Great, and ending with Ludwig on Bismarck, and Romain Rolland on Berlioz. Mr. B. H. Clark found the preparation of the book a " delightful adventure "; certainly the selection must have been an interesting, if hazardous, quest. We are glad to have Roper's "More" and Emerson's "Thoreau," and—many an other.

A book like Prof. K. S. Latourette's *History of Christian Missions in China* (S.P.C.K., 18s.) is the despair of a reviewer. In the first place, it is a big book—843 pp. *plus* 55 pp. of bibliography; then it deals with a big subject, so big that it paralyses the critic, conscious of his utter incompetence. The best he can do, therefore, is to describe the contents of the volume, and let them speak for themselves. Preliminary chapters deal with " The Religious Background of the Chinese " and "The Outstanding Characteristics of Christianity and the bearing of these upon the Possible Acceptance of Christianity in China " (the latter perhaps rather superfluous). Then the narrative begins, getting really into its stride with the resumption of Roman Catholic Missions in the 16th century. With the rise of Protestant Missions and the coming of Morrison in 1807 the the story is told in greater detail, and becomes invaluable. Indeed the book will be indispensable to all students of the history of Christianity in China. Prof. Latourette ends his volume in 1926, and adds a very important chapter, " Summary and Conclusion," which contains, among other things, a striking comparison between Roman Catholic and Protestant Missions in China.

This is a very inadequate notice of a very remarkable book, which must have entailed a tremendous amount of labour. Although it is marvellously cheap for its size and nature, it is, we fear, beyond the reach of many ministers. We hope they will see that it is put on library lists.

In *The Modern World* (Longmans, 3s. 6d.) Mr. F. S. Marvin, well-known as the editor of the "Unity" series, narrates the history of Europe from the French Revolution to the League of Nations, bringing his chronicle to a conclusion with the first meeting of the League in 1920. A chapter on the " Expansion of Science in the New Age—Its Union with Practice and the Welfare of Mankind " reveals Mr. Marvin's special aptitudes.

Mr. D. C. Somervell's *Short History of Our Religion* was greeted with a general chorus of praise. His *English Thought in the 19th Century* (Methuen, 6s.) is not so conspicuously successful, probably because he is here on well-trodden ground. But the book has the same characteristics as the previous one—it is the product of a well-informed, well-balanced, quick mind, and it is alive from the first page to the last. It should be a set book for all members of the New Parliament.

The essays in *Catholic Emancipation, 1829 to 1929* (Longmans, 10s. 6d.) vary a great deal in style and merit, but they deserve the careful consideration of all students of religion, for they show how Roman Catholics (we refuse to allow a Church that unchurches all other Christians to usurp the word 'Catholic') regard their Church and its progress in Great Britain in the century that has elapsed since Emancipation. Cardinal Bourne introduces the volume, and Mr. G. K. Chesterton's concluding chapter on "The Outlook" is very sane. Mr. Algernon Cecil's "The Catholic Church and Literature" is both well written and interesting, and the chapters on education, science, and music are full of information. Abbot Butler's "Religious Orders of Men" is also packed with facts, but Mother Monahan's "Religious Communities of Women" is rather an epic on the nun in history than a discussion of its subject. Father Thurston deals with statistics, and claims that Roman Catholicism has "rather more than kept pace with the natural increase" of population—a much more modest statement than we anticipated.

No worker in the cause of international goodwill must overlook Prof. J. T. Shotwell's *War as an Instrument of International Policy and Its Renunciation in the Pact of Paris* (Constable, 15s.). Prof. Shotwell is one of the best-informed of publicists as well as an accurate historian, and his account of the steps leading up to the Kellogg Pack is reliable, authoritative, and fully documented. The Pact, he urges, is of little use unless it has practical value, and he pleads for intelligence in patriotism so that the anarchy of nations may give way to conceptions of community of interest. Prof. Gilbert Murray stresses the same point in his Introduction: "... nothing is 'unthinkable': and the more real thinking is done now, the less suffering there will be hereafter."

The more work done on the lines of Miss F. B. Boeckel's *War and Peace* (Macmillan, 10s. 6d.) the better. Miss Boeckel is the Education Director of the National Council for the Prevention of War (American), and this volume is "A Handbook for Peace Workers." It aims at furnishing material for American peace workers, especially those out of touch with national organizations and in communities where research is difficult. It is packed with facts, documents, and suggestions, and has a 40 pp. bibliography. A parallel book for this country is a desideratum.

The penultimate chapter of Mr. G. D. H. Cole's *The Next Ten Years in British Social and Economic Policy* (Macmillan, 15s.) is entitled "The Next Labour Government." As that Government comes into office the day these words are written, we hope that we may assume that all its members have read Mr. Cole's book. For it is worth reading, no matter how often its dogmatism irritates and its arguments fail to convince—as they do, for example, on the subject of the National Debt. Mr. Cole has had the courage—an unusual kind of courage—to think through a problem afresh and to revise his opinions where necessary. Here he sets out what he thinks Labour can do now: it includes the formation of a National Labour Corps, in which the unemployed can serve; a system of family allowances, costing at the beginning £100,000,000 a year; and wiping out

the Debt, not by means of a Sinking Fund, but by " drastic and progressive taxation of inheritance." Altogether it is well to have a book like this so that we can see the way our new rulers are likely to take.

Two books by Theodore Dreiser follow (Constable). One, **Dreiser Looks at Russia* (5s.), is readable and serviceable. The other, *Moods* (15s.), is beyond us: it consists of some 200 "poems," "cadenced and declaimed." This is the sort of thing—we open at random, and take " Youth ":—

O tree so tall, so tall,
O star so solitary,
O varnished pool,
A glimmer in the dusk,
Now youth is,
And loneliness
And that vague unhappy-happy yearning
That seeks
And calls
And dreams
Of love.

That's that. Now for the other book. Dreiser, as an " incorrigible individualist," was invited to Russia by the Soviet Government. He went, on his own conditions, and spent eleven weeks, travelling far and wide, and he now describes his experiences and states his findings. He does not agree with the philosophy or the technique of the Soviet form of government, but he thinks that the Russian people are satisfied with it, and that it is likely to spread to, or at least affect, other nations. He approves the system of education, the attitude to sex and marriage, and the simplicity and frugality of the rulers, who receive a maximum of 225 roubles (£25) a month—shades of Lord Birkenhead! Above all, he admires the improved working and living conditions. Can we wonder that Labour secures huge majorities in industrial districts when we read of Russia:—

> At the mines, for instance, in Siberia or Don Basin—(and God, how bleak and windswept these places are!)—are all of those things which make for the safety and comfort of the worker—non-explosive lamps, a system of enforced ventilation underground, electric lights, modern electric drills, gas masks, and so on. And the miner is clothed in special clothing furnished by the government. And at the mine head, to which he may return at the end of six hours, his day's work done, is not only a rest-room but a Russian hot bath. For the miner at the bank-head—the actual driller—works only six hours, because the government considers his work especially dangerous. Other men working, say, in the lateral shafts or outside, work eight (at present) since their work is less dangerous. And he, the mine-head worker, makes 250 roubles a month (25 more than Mr. Stalin or Mr. Lunacharsky), as opposed to from 100 to 150 for others connected with easier work. Also all mine-workers are heavily insured against danger.
>
> In addition, all miners, as well as nearly all active industrial workers at this mine, are housed in newly built 3 or 4 roomed cottages, with a bath, veranda, and a little garden. And for their recreation and entertainment, there is usually a really handsome club building, containing a swimming pool, a bowling alley, a billiard room, a theatre, a reading-room, a library, gymnasium and restaurant. And this club is for men *and* women. And at the mines, or near the factory or office, there are quite regularly a hospital, a sanitarium, a library, a kindergarten, and nursery—in short, as many cultural and uplift facilities for both men and women and their children as possible. And in summer these workers . . . . have a month's vacation with pay . . . .

The chapters on religion, women, art, and literature are very informing.

Mr. G. F. Barwick, late Keeper of the Printed Books in the British Museum, has written an entertaining book on *The Reading Room of the British Museum* (Benn, 10s. 6d.). He tells the story of the Reading Room in a racy fashion, which will delight those who use it. Readers, officials, critics, all appear, and examples are given of amazing requests for information. The book of the quarter for the arm-chair after dinner.

To the Pure . . . (Cape, 10s. 6d.) is " A Study in Obscenity and The Censor," by Mr. M. L. Ernst and Mr. W. Seagle. It is an American work, but it does not overlook the problem in England and on the Continent. It is very thorough in its examination of legal and other censorships, and very emphatic in its condemnation of them all. But the problem is not so easy as these writers seem to think—and it is as difficult in 1929 as ever.

A Literary History of Religious Thought in France (S.P.C.K., 16s.) is an authorized translation (by Miss K. L. Montgomery) of M. Henri Bremond's *Histoire Littéraire du Sentiment Religieux en France depuis la Fin des Guerres de la Religion jusqu'à nos Jours.* This, the first volume, has the title *Devout Humanism,* and brings down the history to Yves de Paris.

If life be long enough we intend one day to read the eleven volumes of Mr. Paul Elmer More's " Shelburne Essays." We shall do this, firstly because we have never understood why Dr. More is so highly esteemed by many Americans whose judgment we respect, and secondly, because *The Demon of the Absolute* (Princeton and Oxford University Presses, 10s. 6d.), the first of a new series of "Shelburne Essays," has a liveliness about it which appeals to us. The volume contains seven essays, the first, which furnishes the title, being about "reason run amuck." English readers, however, will probably find more appetising food in "My Debt to Trollope," "George Borrow," and "Henry Vaughan."

Mr. F. A. Mackenzie's *The Clash of the Cymbals* (Brentano's, 6s.) is an account of " the secret history of the revolt in the Salvation Army." Mr. Mackenzie's narrative is the prelude to the more important part of the book, the appendix of documents, which contains the anonymous letters of staff officers in March, 1925, Commander Evangeline Booth's correspondence with her brother, and other data. Mr. Mackenzie's account makes clear that ample opportunity was given to General Bramwell Booth to reorganize the Army on more democratic lines before the High Council proceeded to act.

We have enjoyed reading Miss Clemence Dane's play, *Mariners* (Heinemann, 2s. 6d.), an extremely clever study of three or four people. We notice that, although Miss Thorndike was in the cast, the play has just been taken off after a short run. Is this due, we wonder, to the fact that there is not enough action to sustain the dialogue?

Mr. John Goss's *An Anthology of Song* (Oxford Press, 8s. 6d. and 5s.) will no doubt get the cordial welcome it merits. It contains 72 songs, many of them old favourites, but some quite unfamiliar, making an admirable blending.

Some of the addresses given in Loretto School Chapel between 1908 and 1926 by the late Allan Ramsay Smith, for many years headmaster, have been gathered together in *Loretto School Sermons* (Oxford Press, 6s.).

If the addresses in the Rev. James Aitchison's *The Triple Chord* (Allenson, 5s.) gripped the " young folks " to whom they were spoken, we can only deduce that children in Scotland are much more solemn and

serious than in England, for we cannot think that either form or content would make them "go down" here.

" Brown Owls " will welcome *Round our Totem* (S. S. U., 2s.), a volume of Sunday talks for Brownies and other children, by Miss R. Tyacke, a Girl Guide Commissioner. They are quite good.

Dodsworth (Cape, 7s. 6d.) is, we think, Mr. Sinclair Lewis at his best: it leaves us wondering and lamenting why he should have allowed himself to descend to the level of *Elmer Gantry*. Here we have that photographic power of description and that subtle analysis of a situation in which not even Mr. Arnold Bennett is his superior, and there is abundant evidence that Mr. Lewis has used his recent visit to Europe to advantage.

A solid, likeable, wealthy, middle-aged American comes to Europe with the first leisure of his life. With him is his beautiful, managing, determined-to-be-youthful wife, a wife, too, who will be the centre of things if she can. The book describes how leisure in England and on the Continent brings out the incompatibilities which had been latent during the twenty years of their married life. Fran is a hateful hussy, and we should not have been human had we not trembled towards the end of the book when it looked as if Mr. Lewis was going to let her win through and doom Sam to another twenty years of purgatory. We have our suspicions, however, that Mr. Lewis intends to deal with Fran again.

Mr. Charles Morgan's *Portrait in a Mirror* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.) succeeds because it is " different." It is not merely that it is much better written than ninety-nine per cent. of modern novels or that its ideas are such as are apparently beyond the reach of most novelists to-day. Nor is it that it does not deal with sex, for it is the story of a man and woman in love who find that the physical expression of love hinders rather than helps.

Can the body be made the vehicle of the spirit? Is there a union of souls which is disturbed and spoilt by the love which, in Rupert Brooke's phrase, " becomes habit "? *Portrait in a Mirror* is not only a readable story, but it leaves us thinking, which is more than most novels do.

The stories in Miss Delafield's *Women Are Like That* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.) deal with unhappy, frustrated, bewildered, and unpleasant people, though it must be admitted that Miss Delafield holds up a mirror to a section of the modern world. In most of the stories women are ruthlessly analysed and their frailties emphasized. Some may feel that Miss Delafield's delight in showing up the weaknesses of her sex is not quite loyal or playing the game; but the cynic would probably retort: " But, you see, women are like that."

To think that in spite of all our pleadings and warnings Mr. Cecil Roberts has come to *Indiana Jane* (Heinemann, 7s. 6d.), which is made up of the smart undergraduate stuff common to the twopenny weekly. It is impossible to read more than a chapter at a time, for every page contains several of the quips which seem to please Mr. Roberts so much, such as: "The man who can shelter behind a woman's skirts these days isn't a coward, he's an acrobat." Mr. Roberts ought to be ashamed of himself, for even in this book—in the last chapters—there is evidence (there was plenty in *Sails of Sunset*) of what he is capable of doing. And surely *he* might have seen that *Nonconformist* was correctly spelt.

We could not imagine that any novelist could have made so successful a story as *Farthing Hall* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.) in the form of letters. And when two writers collaborate the odds against success are more than doubled. But Mr. Hugh Walpole and Mr. J. B. Priestley have not merely

succeeded; they have contrived to end their letters at moments that leave the reader athirst for the next post. At least once the essayist pokes his head into the novel, but on the whole the experiment must be pronounced a conspicuous triumph.

We are not told the name of the translator of Arthur Schnitzler's *Theresa* (Constable, 7s. 6d.), but his work is well done. Take a girl with an insane father and a loveless home; send her out to earn her living in a world where there is no religion, no love, no chivalry, and you have Theresa. The whole is steeped in sex, and the chapters of the book describe *à la* Maupassant Theresa's adventures in her many posts as governess. It is realistic and horrible, but an accurate representation of life in some parts of Central Europe.

The American-Scandinavian Foundation serves an extremely useful purpose in making Scandinavian works available for English-speaking people. The three latest volumes in its list should have a very warm welcome. They are *Norway's Best Stories, Sweden's Best Stories,* and *Denmark's Best Stories* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d. each). They contain selected short stories by 18, 16, and 15 authors respectively, with a biographical note to each author, and form an excellent introduction to the literature of the three countries. EDITOR.

For a treatise on philosophy the Rev. John MacWilliam's *Criticism of the Philosophy of Bergson* (Clark, 9s.) is a curiously heated book, quite in the medieval manner of metaphysical controversy. The writer regards Professor Bergson with extreme disfavour, and treats his reasoning powers with disrespect. The Professor is " unintelligible," " falls into manifest contradiction " or into a " labyrinth of confusion," and so on. The cause of the writer's strong feeling is that he regards Bergson's philosophy as materialistic. Through him he attacks natural science, with its belief in the existence and reality of matter, its addiction to analysis, and its consequent difficulties about atoms and quanta and fields and other vain hypotheses : all of which, the writer holds, are founded in illusion. Reality, it seems, is for him " concrete spirit " : analysis is a false road, a fall of the spirit into error. Truth is not discovered along that road but, if we understand him aright, by synthesis in the Hegelian manner. His quarrel with Bergson, therefore, is that the Professor believes in matter as a real thing, against which creative activity struggles throughout evolution.

We cannot help feeling that such strong partisan feeling is not helpful in philosophy. What we need, perhaps, is the mind that can collect the partial aspects of truth found in different philosophies and reproduce the result for us in a composite picture. No one view can be wholly true, nor wholly false—and, after all, Bergson deserves our respect and is no mean reasoner; he might even have a ready reply to some of the author's strictures.

The book is full of keen thinking and is written brightly and with spirit. It is suggestive and well repays the reader. The writer also deserves our thanks because his style is not burdened with technical expressions. We commend the book to our readers. But it does seem a pity to renew the old conflicts between religion and science nowadays. Why not look rather for the points of convergence and agreement?

HAROLD B. SHEPHEARD.

NEW EDITIONS AND REPRINTS.

JOHN BUNYAN. *The Life and Death of Mr. Badman.* Oxford Press. 3s. 6d. and 2s. World's Classics.

G. M. HARPER. *William Wordsworth: His Life, Works, and Influence.* Murray. 16s. The 3rd (1 vol.) ed. of a classic biography.

G. G. COULTON. *Life in the Middle Ages.* Vols. II and III. Cambridge Press. 6s. each. 1st published in 1 vol. in 1910, now being issued in 4 vols.

J. B. WATSON. *Psychology from a Behaviorist Standpoint.* Lippincott. 12s. 6d. 3rd ed., rev.

C. GARDNER. *Vision and Vesture.* Dent. 4s. 6d. 2nd ed. of a "study of William Blake in Modern Thought."

W. F. ADENEY. *How to Read the Bible.* Independent Press. 2s. 8th ed., with Preface by the Rev. Leyton Richards and revised bibliographies by Dr. A. J. Grieve.

J. A. QUAIL. *Your Bible: Its Ancestry and Origin.* Independent Press. 1s. Shortened Examination Edition.

J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON. *The Historical Character of St. John's Gospel.* Longmans. 3s. 6d. and 2s. 6d. 2nd ed., enlarged by a lecture on "The Present Value of the Fourth Gospel."

ALSO RECEIVED.

St. Mark. Vol. I. Speaker's Bible Office. 9s. 6d. To the end of c. 9.

S. Matthew: Studies by the Bp. of Ripon and Prof. J. A. Findlay. *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs*: Studies by Profs. H. Maclean, W. A. L. Elmslie, D. Russell Scott, and H. Ranston. *John*: Studies by Dr. D. S. Cairns and Dr. J. A. Robertson. *Acts*: Studies by Dr. S. Cave and the Rev. W. F. Howard. Cassell. 3s. 6d. each. "The Study Bible."

N. GOODALL. *Exploring the Bible.* Independent Press. 6d. "A Children's Introduction to the Literature of the Bible."

M. H. WELLS. *Old Testament Days.* Heath Cranton. 2s. For Lower Forms and Preparatory Schools.

JOHN OXENHAM and RODERICK DUNKERLEY. *First Prayers.* 2s. 6d. "A Manual of Help for Parents in the Instruction of Their Children in Prayer." Should be found very useful.

J. S. HOYLAND. *The Divine Companionship.* S.C.M. 2s. 6d. A Book of Prayers.

J. FORT NEWTON. *Altar Stairs.* Macmillan. 7s. 6d. "A Little Book of Prayer."

L. F. HITE. *Swedenborg's Historical Position.* Boston, Mass., New Church Union. $1.25.

GODFREY PHILLIPS. *The Missionary's Job.* Livingstone Press. 1s. An able bit of propaganda.

S. G. HEDGES. *Holding the Senior Boys.* N.S.S.U. 1s. Excellent, worth much more than its cost.

H. BELLMAN. *Architects of the New Age.* Sampson Low. 3s. 6d. Expanded addresses on Bright, Lincoln, Kossuth, Mazzini, Tolstoy.

LECTURES, PAMPHLETS, ETC.

A. S. EDDINGTON. **Science and the Unseen World.* Allen & Unwin. 2s. 6d. and 1s. 6d. Swarthmore Lecture.

J. V. BARTLET, *A Reasonable Faith;* J. NEEDHAM, *Materialism and Religion;* A. E. TAYLOR, *The Problem of Evil.* Benn. 1s. each. "Affirmations" Series.

G. G. COULTON. *The Inquisition.* Benn. 6d.

RENDEL HARRIS, *Go East;* HELEN T. SHERLOCK, *St. Mildred;* RENDEL HARRIS, *St. Mildred's Hair;* Rendel Harris, *An Early Map of Britain.* Heffer. 2s. each. Caravan Essays.

E. BOUDERY. *Priesthood; The Origin of the Mass.* Prot. Truth Soc. 6d. each. Translated by E. J. Dukes.

J. W. POYNTER. *Hilaire Belloc Keeps the Bridge.* Watts. 1s.

S. H. MELLONE. *The Message of the Middle Ages to the Modern World.* Lindsey Press. 1s. 6d. Essex Hall Lecture.

The World's Religions Against War. Church Peace Union. 2s. Proceedings of the Preliminary Conference held at Geneva to arrange for a Universal Religious Peace Conference.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS.

The Holborn Review (April). The most interesting article in this journal is Dr. Peake's comparison of his own one-volume Bible commentary with Bishop Gore's. The Rev. E. Lucas writes on " The Theology of Karl Barth," the Rev. A. T. S. James on " Literature in its Relation to a Minister's Work," the Rev. G. H. Parbrook on " The Jewish Background of the Gospels." Two literary articles are Mr. A. E. Harper's " Coventry Patmore: Poet and Realist " and Miss Nott's " Dorothy Wordsworth," while M. Serge Bernstamm's subject is " French Fairyland Literature." The Rev. W. J. Ferrar's " Stoicism " is a careful summary.

The Hibbert Journal (April). Principal J. B. Baillie writes on " The mind of John Bunyan," Mr. H. W. B. Joseph (critically) on Prof. Eddington's Gifford Lectures. Mr. C. G. Montefiore makes us uncomfortable about attempts to convert the Jews. Dr. Moffatt entertains us by showing us what was happening a hundred years ago. Prof. Leonard Hodgson's " Sin and its Remedy in the Light of Psychology " is valuable. Among the other articles are Canon Tollington's " Reunion—The Present Situation," Miss Muriel Kent's " The Abbé Huvelin: A Study in Spiritual Discernment," Mrs. Campbell's " Faith and Poetry," Prof. J. L. Stocks's " Desire and Affection," Dr. W. S. Crockett's " The Religion of Sir Walter Scott," and Prof. J. W. Scott's " Work *v.* Permanent Unemployment in Great Britain."

The London Quarterly Review (April). Dr. Selbie summaries " What we may learn from Wesley," and another Congregational contribution is the Rev. A. D. Belden's " The Prince of Pulpit Orators." Among the other articles are Canon Lyttelton's " Contemplation in the Christian Life," Mr. L. Keast's " Herbert Hoover, President-elect of the United States of America," Sir Curtis Lampson's "The Religious Psychology of the Pheuls," Miss A. M. Evans's " Some Problems of Jugo-Slavia " and Dr. A. W. Harrison's thoughtful study of Nestorius.

The Baptist Quarterly (April). Extremely interesting is Mr. J. A. Aldis's " Reminiscences of the abolition of Religious Tests in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge." Most of the other articles are historical. Miss M'Lean discusses " The Muslim Dogma of Tradition " and Mr. J. B. Middlebrook begins a study of William Law.

The Modern Churchman (March-May). There are interesting editorial comments on the *Concordat* between Mussolini and the Pope, and on " Voluntary Clergy." Part of Dr. McComb's translation of Heiler's *Das Gebet* is printed. The Rev. J. C. Hardwick has some interesting " Thoughts on the Church " and the Rev. A. H. Collins discusses " Churchyards and Modern Memorials." Mr. Wyatt Tilby's " Religion and the Press " is well-informed.

Church Quarterly Review (April). The Rev. S. G. Dimond writes on " Richard Hooker and the Twentieth Century," the Rev. Roger Lloyd on " John of Salisbury," and Dr. R. Brinton on " The idea of God in the *De Civitate Dei* of S. Augustine." The Rev. R. N. Carew Hunt's " Calvin's Theory of Church and State," is suggestive, as is Dr. W. H. Rigg's " The Fourth Gospel and the Sacraments." The Rev. Roland Allen writes characteristically on Mr. R. S. Wilson's *Indirect Effects of Christian Missions in India,* while his *Voluntary Clergy* is discussed by the Bishop in North China. Dr. W. K. Lowther Clarke's " *Shepherd Easton's Daughter* and the Problem of Perfection " is of great practical value.

Expository Times (March-May). Mr. Will Spens writes on " George Tyrrell," Dr. Moffatt examines *Gore's Commentary.* In the " Books that have influenced our Epoch " series Dr. H. R. Mackintosh discusses Herrmann's *Communion with God* and Canon Quick Streeter's *Reality.* Prof. T. H. Robinson's subject is " The Hebrew Prophets and their Modern Interpretation," and Dr. Rendel Harris's " *Tobit* and the New Testament."

Friends' Quarterly Examiner (Fourth Month). " From the House of the Four Winds " relates a visit to Palestine, and Mrs. Holdsworth describes " Halcyon days in New Zealand." Dr. J. E. Turner's lectures are entitled " Reality,

Philosophy, and Ethics," and in a first article on " Modernism " Miss Constance Maynard compares the " Modern Churchmen's Conference " and the " Keswick Convention."

The International Review of Missions (April). Miss Underhill tells us what the eight German representatives thought of the Jerusalem Meeting, and the Rev. Erasmo Braga writes on " Following up the Jerusalem Meeting in Brazil." Dr. Frank Rawlinson's subject is " Modern Revolution and Religion in China," Miss Mildred Cable's " Central Asia as a Mission Field," Dr. A. H. Clark's " Devolution," Mr. P. Oomman Philip tells of " Experiments in Indian Expressions of Christian Service " and Miss Ruth Rouse of " Dispersions: Oriental and African."

World Dominion (April). China, India, Arabia, the Congo, Latin America, Morocco, *etc.*—this number tells of missionary enterprise in all these lands. Miss Olive Wyon's " Arabia and her Destiny " (the first of three parts) is the outstanding article.

British Journal of Inebriety (April). The main article is Dr. Catherine Chisholm's " Alcohol and Drug Addiction in Relation to Women and Children." Among the other subjects treated we have " The Ayahuasca and Jagé Cults," " The Management of the Inebriate," and " Intemperance and the N.S.P.C.C."

The Review of the Churches (April). After the Editorial, which covers a great variety of subjects, the first place is given to a discussion on " Unpaid Clergy," in which the Editor, the Bishop of Southampton and Canon Lacey take part. Among the remaining articles are Dr. Brilioth's " The Eucharist in the Lutheran Church," the Rev. L. E. P. Erith's " The Fallacy of British-Israelism," Canon Raven's " God and Mammon," Mr. Basil Mathews's " Youth's Modern Substitutes for Religion " and a rather flippant discussion of clerical celibacy by the Rev. D. Morse-Boycott.

The Evangelical Quarterly (April). This fundamentalist review denounces Sir George Adam Smith, Prof. Souter, Canon Streeter, and all who accept evolution and modern Biblical criticism. One or two articles on non-Biblical subjects are worth reading.

The Yale Review (Spring). English readers will turn first to Prof. H. J. Laski's thorough analysis of " England in 1929 " and Sir Arthur Salter's " The Coming Economic Struggle." Four interesting literary articles are Miss Edith Wharton's " Visibility in Fiction," Mr. Francis Brett Young's " Confessions of a Novelist," Prof. W. C. Abbott's " Macaulay and the New History " and Prof. W. L. Phelps's " Conversations with George Moore." M. Louis A. DeBord's story, " Old Man Jones," is well told.

The Harvard Theological Review (April). The two articles which almost make up the whole of this number are Mr. R. H. Bainton's " The Development and Consistency of Luther's Attitude to Religious Liberty " and Prof. B. W. Bacon's " As to the Canonization of *Matthew*."

The Princeton Theological Review (January). Prof. Vos discusses " The Pauline Doctrine of the Resurrection," Mr. George Johnson " The Religion of the Scientifically Minded." In " The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament " Professor R. D. Wilson argues that " the Hebrew Scriptures have, as a matter of fact and evidence, been handed down from the time they were written in a substantially correct form," while in " Was Jesus a Modernist? " the editor criticizes Dr. J. H. Snowden's *Old Faith and New Knowledge*.

The Review and Expositor (Baptist, Louisville, Kentucky, April). A " Mullins Memorial Number," the first two articles dealing with the life and work of President E. Y. Mullins. Dr. J. H. Rushbrooke writes on " The Baptists of Russia " and Prof. Bowman gives a detailed account of the Robertson Codex of the Gospels (Minusc. 2358), purchased by Dr. Deissmann in 1926.

Anglican Theological Review (April). Prof. B. W. Bacon continues his study of " Pauline Elements in the Fourth Gospel " examining the " Parables of the Shepherd " (*John* $10^{10.39}$). Canon Quick has a thoughful article on " Original Sin and Baptism," and Mr. C. A. Manning writes on " Bulgakov and the Orthodox Church." Prof. Hallock gives a useful reading course on Moral Theology, but he omits some recent books.